

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
AND AFTER

No. CCLXXXVII—JANUARY 1901



This Janiform head, adapted from a Greek coin of Tenedos at the request of the Editor, by Sir Edward J. Poynter, P.R.A., tells, in a figure, all that need be said of the alteration made to-day in the title of the Review.

MIDNIGHT—THE 31ST OF DECEMBER 1900

Lo! now on the midnight the soul of the century passing,
And on midnight the voice of the Lord!
'In the years that have been I have made an oblivion for
anguish,
And stillness in place of a cry;
I have lain round the knife as a numbness, on nerves as an
ether,
I am He that hath healed,' saith the Lord.
'I have fallen as a veil upon woe, as a slumber on sorrow,
As a blank on the reeling brain.
In the years that have been I have shown me a smother of
pillows,
A closer of fixed eyes.
In the years that shall be I will come as an healer to cities,
And as dew to a parchèd land.
In that day shall the Northern City, the country of iron,
Lapse into living green,
And the city of furnaces fade, the city of wheels,
The city of the white faces,
The girding city, the city of gongs and of hammers,
Whose floor is of embers and ashes.
And her in whose soul the iron hath entered, whose bosom
Is filled with a fatal milk,
Whose spirit fainteth in greyness of lead, and whose
yearning
Hath died in a phosphorus mist,
I will lead out of hissing and venomous travail and vapour
To a city spacious and clear.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XLIX

	PAGE
FRONTISPIECE. By <i>Sir Edward J. Poynter</i>	1
MIDNIGHT, DECEMBER 31ST, 1900. By <i>Stephen Phillips</i>	2
A NEW CENTURY AND AN OLD RIDDLE. By <i>Mrs. Chapman</i>	7
ENGLAND'S PEASANTRY—THEN AND NOW. By the <i>Rev. Dr. Jessopp</i>	16
THE ADMIRALTY AND SUBMARINE BOATS. By <i>Edmund Robertson</i>	30
ON SPION KOP. By <i>L. Oppenheim</i>	39
SCIENTIFIC USE OF HOSPITALS. By <i>Sir Michael Foster</i>	57
THE RÔLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY II. By <i>Lady Ponsonby</i>	64
'THE SOURCES OF ISLAM.' By the <i>Moulvie Rafiuddin Ahmad</i>	77
TOOLIGANISM. By <i>John Trevarthen</i>	84
A DAY OF PURIFICATION. By <i>Henry Jephson</i>	90
THE NICARAGUA CANAL QUESTION. By <i>Robert Bromley</i>	100
VARYING IDEALS OF HUMAN BEAUTY. By <i>John Collier</i>	116
CURRENT POLITICS:	
(1) A LIBERAL VIEW. By <i>Sir Wemyss Reid</i>	131
(2) A CONSERVATIVE VIEW. By <i>Sidney Low</i>	147
THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES. By the <i>Bishop of Newport</i>	159
NOTE ON THE PAPAL INDULGENCE AT OBERAMMERGAU. By the <i>Editor</i>	174
LORD ROBERTS ON ARMY REFORM	177
IN MEMORIAM QUEEN VICTORIA: AN EPITAPH	197
VICTORIA THE GOOD: A SONNET. By <i>Sir Theodore Martin</i>	198
LAST MONTH. By <i>Sir Wemyss Reid</i>	199, 530, 719, 889, 1064
MY WAYS AND DAYS IN EUROPE AND IN INDIA. By <i>Maharajah Gaekwar of Baroda</i>	215
THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK IN THE TRANSVAAL. By <i>Arthur B. Markham</i>	226
CLEARING NATAL. By <i>L. Oppenheim</i>	240
SHAM <i>versus</i> REAL HOME DEFENCE. By <i>Colonel Lonsdale Hale</i>	248
OUR ABSURD SYSTEM OF PUNISHING CRIME. By <i>Robert Anderson</i>	268
A PLEA FOR THE SOUL OF THE IRISH PEOPLE. By <i>George Moore</i>	285
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES. By <i>Herbert Paul</i>	296
'PI-PA-KI, OR SAN-POU-TSONG.' By <i>Professor Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett</i>	307
THE HIGHER GRAMMAR BOARD SCHOOLS. By <i>Sir Joshua Fitch</i>	321
WHAT WERE THE CHERUBIM? By the <i>Rev. Dr. A. Smythe Palmer</i>	332
OFFICIAL OBSTRUCTION OF ELECTRIC PROGRESS. By <i>Professor J. A. Fleming</i>	348
'THE SOURCES OF ISLAM.' By the <i>Rev. W. St. Clair-Tisdall</i>	364
THE QUESTION OF THE NATIVE RACES IN SOUTH AFRICA. By <i>John Macdonell</i>	367
THE CIVIL LIST. By <i>Edmund Robertson</i>	377
CHURCH REFORM. WHY NOT BEGIN WITH THE PARISH? By the <i>Lord Bishop of Hereford</i>	389
THE SOUTH AFRICAN HOSPITALS COMMISSION. By <i>Frederick Treves</i>	396
SHAM <i>versus</i> REAL HOME DEFENCE. By <i>Dr. A. Conan Doyle</i>	406
THE ADMIRALTY <i>versus</i> THE NAVY. By <i>H. W. Wilson</i>	416
THE DRAMA IN THE ENGLISH PROVINCES. By <i>Henry Arthur Jones</i>	431
IMPERIAL CIVIL SERVICE: A SUGGESTION FROM AUSTRALIA. By <i>Professor Edward E. Morris</i>	445
VERDI. By <i>Edvard Grieg</i>	451
THE BRITISH WORKMAN AND HIS COMPETITORS. By <i>William Woodward</i>	456
STRATA IN THE ROMAN FORUM. By <i>Giacomo Boni</i>	491

	PAGE
SOME AMERICAN IMPRESSIONS OF EUROPE. By <i>Philip Alexander Bruce</i>	472
MONARCHY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By <i>Sidney Low</i>	487
MARIA HOLROYD. By <i>Mrs. Margaret L. Woods</i>	500
LEADERS OF OPPOSITION—BEFORE AND AFTER 1832. By <i>T. E. Kebbel</i>	514
ROMNEY'S PORTRAITS AT THE GRAFTON GALLERY. By <i>Robert C. Witt</i>	523
OUR LAST EFFORT FOR A VOLUNTARY ARMY:	
(1) A CIVILIAN VIEW. By <i>Henry Birchenough</i>	545
(2) A MILITARY VIEW. By <i>Major-General Frank S. Russell</i>	555
SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR ARMY REFORM:	
(1) MILITARY TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR LADS. By <i>Sir Herbert Maxwell</i>	586
(2) A MILITARY PROVIDENT FUND. By <i>the Earl of Arran</i>	574
(3) ARMY NUMBING. By <i>Miss Ethel McColl</i>	580
THE MODESTY OF ENGLISHWOMEN. By <i>Mrs. William Mahood</i>	588
EMIGRATION FOR GENTLEWOMEN. By <i>Arthur Montefiore Brice</i>	601
DOCTORS IN HOSPITALS. By <i>B. Burford Rawlings</i>	611
THE BACTERIA BEDS OF MODERN SANITATION. By <i>Lady Priestley</i>	624
BRITISH COMMUNICATION WITH EAST AND SOUTH AFRICA. By <i>Evelyn Cecil</i>	630
COMPANY LAW REFORM. By <i>R. Gervase Elwes</i>	638
ROBERT BROWNING THE MUSICIAN. By <i>Miss A. Goodrich-Freer</i>	648
ENCYCLOPEDIA MAXIMA. By <i>Herbert A. Giles</i>	659
THE FIRST QUEEN OF PRUSSIA. By <i>W. H. Wilkins</i>	668
AN 'ADVANCED' VIEW OF THE 'CHURCH CRISIS.' By <i>the Rev. W. J. Scott</i>	679
AUGUSTIN RODIN. By <i>the Count de Soissons</i>	693
THE KING'S TEST DECLARATION. By <i>Sir George Sherston Baker</i>	698
LORD CURZON IN INDIA. By <i>Stephen Wheeler</i>	708
THE COSTS OF THE WAR. By <i>the Earl of Camperdown</i>	729
THE RECENT ANGLO-ROMAN PASTORAL. By <i>Viscount Halifax</i>	736
OUR BOER PRISONERS: A SUGGESTED OBJECT LESSON. By <i>Mrs. John Richard Green</i>	755
THE NATIONAL THEATRE. By <i>Frank R. Benson</i>	772
RELATIONSHIP OF HOSPITALS TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS. By <i>Sir Samuel Wilks</i>	781
ASTRONOMICAL LABORATORIES. By <i>Arthur R. Hinks</i>	789
THE HOUSING PROBLEM. By <i>the Rev. Canon Barnett</i>	794
THE NOVELS OF ANTHONY TROLLOPE. By <i>Walter Frewen Lord</i>	805
THE NATIVE INDIAN PRESS. By <i>J. D. Rees</i>	817
'AUSTRALIA FOR THE WHITE MAN' AGAIN. By <i>Gilbert Parker</i>	829
KORRA FROM THE JAPANESE STANDPOINT. By <i>H. N. G. Bushby</i>	834
THE BLUNDER OF MODERN EDUCATION. By <i>Harold E. Gorst</i>	843
OUR RACE AS PIONEERS. By <i>G. F. Watts</i>	849
IS LAW FOR THE PEOPLE OR FOR THE LAWYERS? By <i>His Honour Judge Emden</i>	858
CO-OPERATIVE PROFIT-SHARING CANTEENS. By <i>the Hon. John W. Fortescue</i>	874
THE DISASTROUS NEW ARMY SCHEME. By <i>R. Yerburgh</i>	879
BRITISH PESSIMISM. By <i>Andrew Carnegie</i>	901
IMPRESSIONS OF AMERICA. By <i>Frederic Harrison</i>	913
THE STANDARD OF STRENGTH FOR OUR ARMY: A BUSINESS ESTIMATE. By <i>Sir Robert Giffen</i>	931
THE QUEEN VICTORIA MEMORIAL HALL IN INDIA. By <i>the Viceroy of India</i>	949
THE RELIGION OF THE BOERS. By <i>the Rev. Dr. Wigram</i>	960
THE NEXT CORONATION. By <i>L. W. Vernon Harcourt</i>	975
THREE SCENES FROM M. ROSTAND'S 'L'AIGLON.' By <i>Earl Cowper</i>	988
THE EDUCATION BILL. By <i>Dr. T. J. Macnamara</i>	998
THE HOUSE OF COMMONS. By <i>L. A. Atherley-Jones</i>	1004
OUR OFFERS TO SURRENDER GIBRALTAR. By <i>Walter Frewen Lord</i>	1012
MR. SARGENT AT THE ROYAL ACADEMY. By <i>H. Hamilton Fyfe</i>	1022
THE PRESSING NEED FOR MORE UNIVERSITIES. By <i>Professor Ernest H. Starling</i>	1028
SOME REAL LOVE LETTERS. By <i>Mrs. Chapman</i>	1038
A LAND OF WOE. By <i>the Countess of Menth</i>	1050
THE RECRUITING QUESTION: A POSTSCRIPT TO THE ARMY DEBATE. By <i>Arthur H. Lee</i>	1056

INDEX TO VOL. XLIX

The titles of articles are printed in italics

ADM

- A**DMIRALTY, *The, and Submarine boats*, 80-88
Admiralty, The, versus the Navy, 416-480
Africa, East and South, British Communication with, 680-687
 Agricultural labourers a century ago and now, 16-29
 Ahmad (Moulvie Rafiuddin), '*The Sources of Islām*,' 77-88; reply to, 864, 865
America, Impressions of, 918-930
American Impressions of Europe, Some, 472-486
 American submarine boats, 84-88
 Anderson (Robert), *Our Absurd System of Punishing Crime*, 268-284
 Anglican ritual and the 'Church Crisis,' 679-692
Anglo-Roman Pastoral, The Recent, 786-784
 Army and Navy Estimates, 723-726
Army Nursing, 580-587
 Army reform, defects of the recruiting system, 1056-1068
Army Reform, Lord Roberts's suggestions for, 177-196
Army Reform, Some Suggestions for, 566-587
Army Scheme, The Disastrous New, 879-888
Army, The Standard of Strength for our, 981-948
Army, Voluntary, Our Last Effort for a, 545-565
 Arran (Earl of), *A Military Provident Fund*, 574-579
 Artists' differing ideals of human beauty, 116-130
Astronomical Laboratories, 789-793
 Atharley-Jones (L. A.), *The House of Commons*, 1004-1011
 'Australia for the White Man' again, 829-838
 Australian federation, 185, 186, 1076

BACTERIA *Beds of Modern Sanitation*, 624-629

BUS

- Baker (Sir George Sherston), *The King's Test Declaration*, 698-707
 Barnett (Rev. Canon), *The Housing Problem*, 794-804
 Baroda (The Maharajah Gaekwar of), *My Ways and Days in Europe and in India*, 215-225
Beauty, Human, Varying Ideals of, 116-130
 Benson (Frank R.), *The National Theatre*, 772-780
 Biggarsberg passes, capture of, 240-247
 Birchenough (Henry), *Our Last Effort for a Voluntary Army: a Civilian View*, 545-554
Board Schools, The Higher Grade, 321-381
Boer Prisoners, Our: a Suggested Object-Lesson, 755-771
Boers, The Religion of the, 960-974
 Boni (Giacomo), *Strata in the Roman Forum*, 461-471
 Brice (Arthur Montefiore), *Emigration for Gentlewomen*, 601-610
British Communication with East and South Africa, 680-687
British Pessimism, 901-912
 British race as civilisers in South Africa, 849-857
British Workman, The, and his Competitors, 456-460
 Brodrick's (Mr.) scheme for Army Reform, 545-567, 723, 724, 879-888, 1067-1069
 Bromley (Robert), *The Nicaragua Canal Question*, 100-115
 Browning (Robert) *the Musician*, 648-658
 Bruce (Philip Alexander), *Some American Impressions of Europe*, 472-486
 Budget, *The, and the cost of the War*, 869-900, 1066, 1067
 Building trade depression and idle workmen, 456-460
 Bushby (H. N. G.), *Korea from the Japanese Standpoint*, 874-842

GAL

- CALVINISM** and fanaticism of the Boers, 960-974
 Camperdown (Earl of), *The Costs of the War*, 729-735
 Canteens, *Co-operative Profit-sharing*, 874-878
 Carnegie (Andrew), *British Pessimism*, 901-912
 Catholic Doctrine of Indulgences, *The*, 159-173
 Cecil (Evelyn), *British Communication with East and South Africa*, 630-637
 Chamberlain, Mr., personal attacks upon, 140-142, 150-152
 Chapman (Hon. Mrs.), *A New Century and an Old Riddle*, 7-15; *Some Real Love Letters*, 1088-1049
Cherubim, What were the? 832-847
 Children, the proper way of developing their minds, 848-848
 China, Russian schemes in, 899
 China, the troubles in, 212, 543, 1076
 Chinese literature, destruction of the 'Complete Record', 659-665
 Chinese moral plays, 807-820
Church Crisis, An 'Advanced' View of the, 679-692
Church Reform: Why not begin with the Parish? 889-895
Civil List, The, 877-888
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, The Nicaragua Canal Question and the, 100-115
 Cleanliness and health, crusade against dirt, 90-99
 Cockerton judgment, *The*, and secondary education, 998-1003, 1069
 Collier (Hon. John), *Varying Ideals of Human Beauty*, 116-180
 Colonies, Work and welcome for our girls in the, 601-610
Company Law Reform, 638-647
 Conservative view of current politics, 147-158
 Co-operation and profit-sharing applied to Army canteens, 874-878
 Coran, *The*, its origin and teaching, 77-98, 864, 865
Coronation, The Next, 975-987
 Counsel's fees, 865, 866
 Cowper (Earl), *Three Scenes from M. Rostand's 'L'Aiglon'*, 988-997
 Creighton (Bishop), death of, 213, 214
Crime, Our Absurd System of Punishing, 288-284
 Crown lands and hereditary revenues of the Sovereign, 877-888
Current Politics: A Liberal View

FRE

Queen Victoria Memorial Hall in India, 949-958

- DAY** of Purification, *A*, 90-99
 Demise of the Crown Bill, 896, 897
Doctors in Hospitals, 611-628
 Doyle's (Dr. Conan) scheme for Defence of Great Britain criticised, 248-267
 Doyle (Dr. A. Conan), *Sham versus Real Home Defence*, 406-415
 Drama, Decay of the, a National Theatre as a remedy, 772-780

- EDUCATION** Bill, *The*, 998-1008
 Education, Higher primary, 821-831
Education, Modern, The Blunder of, 843-848
Electric Progress, Official Obstruction of, 848-863
 Elwes (R. Gervase), *Company Law Reform*, 638-647
 Emden (Judge), *Is Law for the People or for the Lawyers?* 858-873
Emigration for Gentlewomen, 601-610
Encyclopædia Maxima, 659-665
England's Peasantry—Then and Now, 16-29
 English rule in India as viewed by the native press, 817-828
Englishwomen, The Modesty of, 588-600
Epitaph, An (for Queen Victoria), 197
Europe and India, My Ways and Days in, 215-225
Europe, Some American Impressions of, 472-486

- FITCH** (Sir Joshua), *The Higher Grade Board Schools*, 321-331
 Fleming (Professor J. A.), *Official Obstruction of Electric Progress*, 848-863
 Flower (Eliza), poet, musician, and friend of Browning, 650, 651
 Fortescue (Hon. John W.), *Co-operative Profit-sharing Canteens*, 874-878
 Forum, Roman, Excavations, 461-471
 Foster (Sir Michael), *Scientific Use of Hospitals*, 57-68
 France, higher elementary schools in, 321, 322
 Franco-Italian festivities at Tonkin

And I will abolish utterly smoke and confusion,
On roaring will set my feet ;
On the wailing whistle of engines, the tunnelled shrieking,
The groaning labour of steam ;
On the houses with windows as eyes that stare, yet see not
The forlorn, the endless vistas.
I will make me a city of gliding and wide-wayed silence,
With a highway of glass and of gold,
With life of a coloured peace and a lucid leisure
Of smooth electrical ease ;
Of sweet excursion of noiseless and brilliant travel,
With room in your streets for the soul.
And that blistering wind that maketh the heart to withdraw,
And the spirit to flinch from love,
Ye shall change it to balm, and the South-wind shall blow
in your houses
The rainy soul of the rose.
And a charm ye shall take from the ebbing and flowing of
ocean
That shall make the night as the day.
And the stored strength of the tides ye shall use for your
labour,
And bind it to tasks and to toil.
Yet forget not the beauty of night in her coming and going,
Forget not the sprinkled vault,
Nor eve with her floating bird and her lonely star,
Nor the reddening clouds of the eve ;
Forget not the moon of the poet, nor stars of the dreamer,
Though ye live like to spirits in ease.

‘In the years that have been I have bound man closer to
man,
And closer woman to woman ;
And the stranger hath seen in a stranger his brother at last,
And a sister in eyes that were strange.

‘For this cause I will make of your warfare a terrible thing,
A thing impossible, vain;
For a man shall set his hand to a handle and wither
Invisible armies and fleets,
And a lonely man with a breath shall exterminate armies,
With a whisper annihilate fleets;
And the captain shall sit in his chamber and level a city,
The far-off capital city.
Then the Tzar that dreameth in snow and broodeth in
winter,
That foiled dreamer in frost,
And the Teuton Emperor then, and the Gaul and the
Briton
Shall cease from impossible war,
Discarding their glittering legions, armadas of iron,
As children toys that are old.
As a man hath been brought, I will bring unto judgment a
nation;
Nor shall numbers be pleaded for sin.
And that people to whom I gave in commission the ocean
To use my waters for right,
Let them look to the inward things, to the searching of
spirit,
And cease from boasting and noise.
Then nation shall cleave unto nation, and Babel shall fall:
They shall speak in a common tongue,
And the soul of the Gaul shall leap to the soul of the
Briton
Through all disguises and shows;
And soul shall speak unto soul—I weary of tongues,
I weary of babble and strife.
Lo! I am the bonder and knitter together of spirits,
I dispense with nations and shores.

‘In the years that have been, in the rocks I have shown ye
a record
And a ledger in layers of chalk;

I have shown ye a book and a diary faithful in caverns,
An account in the depths of the earth.
When ye swayed to and fro as a jelly in ooze of the ocean,
I foresaw, I determined, I planned.
And I brooded on primal ooze as a mother broodeth,
And slime as a cradle I watched.
When ye hung on the branches of trees, when ye swung and
ye chattered,
I made ready, prepared and decreed
That in years that should be I would bring ye with patience
through æons,
From slime through the forest of bliss ;
I would wean ye from climbings and fury to wings and to
wisdom,
From dark sea-stupor to life.

‘In the years that have been I have broken the barriers to
knowledge,
I have shattered your barriers and bars ;
I have led, like steeds from a stable, Forces and Powers,
I have bidden ye mount them and ride.
In the years that shall be ye shall harness the Powers of the
æther
And drive them with reins as a steed ;
Ye shall ride on a Power of the air, on a Force that is
bridled,
On a saddled Element leap ;
And rays shall be as your coursers, and heat as a carriage,
And waves of the æther your wheels ;
And the thunder shall be as a servant, a slave that is
ready,
And the lightning as he that waits.
Ye shall send on your business the blast, and the tempest
on errands,
Ye shall use for your need, Eclipse.
In that day shall a man out of uttermost India whisper,
And in England his friend shall hear ;

'For this cause I will make of your warfare a terrible thing,
A thing impossible, vain ;

For a man shall set his hand to a handle and wither
Invisible armies and fleets,

And a lonely man with a breath shall exterminate armies,
With a whisper annihilate fleets ;

And the captain shall sit in his chamber and level a city,
The far-off capital city.

Then the Tzar that dreameth in snow and broodeth in
winter,

That foiled dreamer in frost,

And the Teuton Emperor then, and the Gaul and the
Briton

Shall cease from impossible war,

Discarding their glittering legions, armadas of iron,
As children toys that are old.

As a man hath been brought, I will bring unto judgment a
nation ;

Nor shall numbers be pleaded for sin.

And that people to whom I gave in commission the ocean
To use my waters for right,

Let them look to the inward things, to the searching of
spirit,

And cease from boasting and noise.

Then nation shall cleave unto nation, and Babel shall fall ;

They shall speak in a common tongue,

And the soul of the Gaul shall leap to the soul of the
Briton

Through all disguises and shows ;

And soul shall speak unto soul—I weary of tongues,
I weary of babble and strife.

Lo ! I am the bonder and knitter together of spirits,
I dispense with nations and shores.

'In the years that have been, in the rocks I have shown ye
a record

And a ledger in layers of shell.

I have shown ye a book and a diary faithful in caverns,
An account in the depths of the earth.
When ye swayed to and fro as a jelly in ooze of the ocean,
I foresaw, I determined, I planned.
And I brooded on primal ooze as a mother broodeth,
And slime as a cradle I watched.
When ye hung on the branches of trees, when ye swung and
ye chattered,
I made ready, prepared and decreed
That in years that should be I would bring ye with patience
through æons,
From slime through the forest of bliss ;
I would wean ye from climbings and fury to wings and to
wisdom,
• From dark sea-stupor to life.

‘In the years that have been I have broken the barriers to
knowledge,
I have shattered your barriers and bars ;
I have led, like steeds from a stable, Forces and Powers,
I have bidden ye mount them and ride.
In the years that shall be ye shall harness the Powers of the
æther
And drive them with reins as a steed ;
Ye shall ride on a Power of the air, on a Force that is
bridled,
On a saddled Element leap ;
And rays shall be as your coursers, and heat as a carriage,
And waves of the æther your wheels ;
And the thunder shall be as a servant, a slave that is
ready,
And the lightning as he that waits.
Ye shall send on your business the blast, and the tempest
on errands,
Ye shall use for your need, Eclipse.
In that day shall a man out of uttermost India whisper,
And in England his friend shall hear ;

And a maiden in English sunshine have sight of her lover,
And he behold her from Cathay.
In that day shall ye walk to and fro on the sea without
terror,
And pace without fear the foam,
As a field of the evening the Mediterranean lying,
The Atlantic a lawn for your feet.

' Yet remember the ancient things, the things that have been,
And meekly inherit the Earth !
And or ever those days be ended, the veil shall be rent—
The veil upon Nature's face.
And the dead whom ye loved, ye shall walk with, and speak
with the lost.

The delusion of Death shall pass :
The delusion of mounded earth, the apparent withdrawal,
The snare of sightlessness vanish.
Ye shall shed your bodies, and upward shall flutter to
freedom,

For a moment consent to the ground.
Lo ! I am the burster of bonds and the breaker of barriers—
I am He that shall free,' saith the Lord.
For the lingering battle, the contest of ages is ending,
And victory followeth Me.

They set them in order of battle, they ranged them against
Me—

Chaos and Anguish and Time
and Madness and Hunger and Sorrow and Night and the
Grave—

But victory followeth Me.
Lo ! I come, I hasten, I set my procession in order,
In order of triumph I come ;
t the wheels of my chariot pacing, like alien captives,
Anguish and Time and Death,
hrough a multitude out of the uttermost spheres assembled,
With a shout of delivered stars.'

A NEW CENTURY AND AN OLD RIDDLE

Y. Ah, welcome! I was thinking of you just now, and how long it is since I had seen you—not since your illness. But now I can congratulate you on your recovery this New Year's Day, and New Century Day. *Bonne journée, bonne œuvre.*

X. Your kind welcome is *bonne œuvre*, that's certain; whether it is *bonne œuvre* to have recovered footing on this ground, why, that is another matter. It's dubious to me, just as it is dubious whether this first day of January, 1901, is *bonne journée* for the planet and its inhabitants.

Y. Oh dear! what big words—monstrous words! Some people say, 'Why make a fuss about the 1st of January, 1901, any more than about the last Tuesday was a twelvemonth?' I am not one of them. I ignorantly worship the new century. But I say to my friends, Do let us put away all these pessimistic follies with the nineteenth hundred of grace, and start afresh with the twentieth. Let us——

X. Forgive my interrupting you, but I am anxious to ask—Is there, do you think, any better ground for putting away pessimistic for hopeful questioning of the Sphinx because this is the 1st of January, 1901, than there was on the 1st of January, 1900 (always supposing it is worth while to question the Sphinx at all)?

Y. Of course it would be irrational to say yes. This is a mere arbitrary point of our own fixing, in the whirling cycle; we are all agreed as to that. But it strikes the imagination—it's a peg to hang one's thoughts on.

X. But why should they be any less pessimistic thoughts than before? It is not proved to me that pessimism is folly. Are you so youthful in heart as to think there is the slightest probability that the sickness of these latter times will be cured, in that a new measure is begun in their tale of years?

Y. No, I am not. But I do think it worth while for a few of us sick folk—as sick in mind as you have been in body—to reconsider our conclusions, now that we are pointedly appealed to by our own almanacks.

X. It still seems to me that you give the almanack an altogether imaginary *Standpunkt* whence to sermonise mankind.

Whether we choose to reckon by fifties or by hundreds or by thousands of years is 'neither here nor there.' The tiresome riddle of human existence remains as before, for those who choose to pay any attention to it.

Y. *Vous prêchez une convertie*, my dear friend. The reckoning by centuries is of our making, of course. But day and night, and the seasons and the years, are not of our making, nor yet the immeasurable stream of change, which has been rushing round and round, and yet forward, since 'the planet' cooled into a coherent shape.

X. And what then?

Y. I humbly suggest to you to think of this word 'forward.' I say, here is a point that we have marked for ourselves in the flux of time. Well, it suggests to us, inevitably, fresh wonderment at that flux which is carrying us all—fresh questioning—whence? and whither? How? why?—

X. Very likely. But is there any profit in all your wonder and questioning?

Y. I venture to think there may be some. I was going on to say that there would seem to be a progress toward some far-off goal, as well as the rushing round and round—

The rushing and the rolling of the reons of the years—

in the course of this world. A forward movement—

X. Of a sort—

Y. —seems to be intended by the great unknown directing Power. So much, it would seem, we may infer, even apart from the Christian position.

X. Possibly.

Y. If so, my contention is that it is worth while to consider, as we look at this little point in the almanack, whether it may not signalise new thoughts—or rather new-old—of our position and outlook, pains and joys and hopes. May we not profitably revert to old conceptions of life—

X. Reversion and progress are not usually reckoned convertible terms.

Y. You would not hear my sentence out. It is difficult to make one's meaning clear, in such discussions as this, without appearing pompous and verbose—or at least wearisome.

X. No, no; say on.

Y. Well, I am clumsily trying to argue that reversion may lead to progress; that if we take heart, and resume the old conception of life that the great ages of Greece, for instance, had—thinking of it much more simply than has been our modern wont, as a good and happy, beautiful and powerful thing in itself, not troubling ourselves with all the drawbacks possible, nor asking 'What is the use?' at

has something that we had lost and are glad to regain, we can add to it and make it larger and richer; that life and thought, in a word, have made progress in the lapse of centuries.

X. I fail to see it. I could almost say I see none but mechanical progress. You speak of the Greeks. Now, in mental initiative, both in art and dialectics, we simply subsist on the old Greek methods. If we seem taller, perhaps, than they, it is because we stand upon their shoulders. *They* raised this structure of thought and life upon the common ground. We may make better buttons, and steam and fuss ourselves round the world in ways unknown to them; but all this has not a jot to say to true progress. Life may be a sorry and mean thing, thought may be poor and grovelling, with possession of the best buttons and the most powerful steam-engines. And so life and thought often seem to me, as to many other observers of the present state of the world.

Y. You cling very lovingly to your old Greeks. It is an attitude I have often observed in persons of your sex; perhaps it is because the great ages of Greece are, in the main, masculine ground, where only a select few women can follow, and whence you can, therefore, safely extol Greek thought and Greek life to us, the female laity; just as the Golden Age remains golden because nobody ever knew it. But I don't wish to banter. I suppose it is true that sheer mundane happiness, the full and honest use and enjoyment of life, prevailed with the old Greeks as it does not with us; that they took life more simply and 'naturally' than we do, and were, so far as this world goes, in a healthier state than we. Did I not, despite your scoff, propose reversion—in some sense—to their conceptions?

X. True.

Y. And I suppose I am credibly informed when you tell me that in art and dialectics there is virtually no new thing since the great Greek initiative. But the Greeks had surely no 'talent for religion,' as we understand the word?

X. Well, no; that is, I should say, a tolerably fair account—if a vague, allusive phrase can give account of anything.

Y. I am not competent to more than quoting other people's conclusions in the matter; but——

X. Well, your allusive phrase has, for the nonce, answered the end of language. For I think I understand what you mean; and as far as I am competent I agree with it.

Y. Now, then, I venture a little further. It is in religion and morals—where the Greeks failed—that I should claim progress in other branches of mankind; progress which may encourage us to hope, and even joy, on beginning the new century.

X. I admire. But you must unfold the reasons for your hope and joy. To many of us religion and morals seem in a parlous condition. I do not mean by this that people are more irreligious or

immoral than they have been for many hundred years. I do not believe that mankind will ever shake itself free from the need of some kind of religion, or that it will ever be able to dispense with some code of morality. But what religion? and what morality? what foundations? and what sanctions? The old bases and sanctions seem to have decayed very much; are they to be, can they be repaired? or are we to establish new? And if we are, how shall we set about it?

Y. People have had all this reiterated in their ears for a very long while; it is at least as old as Bishop Butler's day. You remember how he complains of the easy chatter of the Georgian tea-tables, disposing of the Christian religion and the Christian morality as effete superstitions, *quantités négligeables*. But the attitude of men's minds has been changing while this kind of talk (which is itself less flippant in our days than in Butler's) has been repeated and echoed about; and surely it is evident to every candid observer that there has been a great revival of religion, and of the belief in the religious sanction of morality, during the last sixty or seventy years of the late century.

X. That is true—but by no means the whole truth in the matter. You yourself note that the sceptical treatment of the old foundations and sanctions is 'less flippant' now than in Bishop Butler's time. And there, in a word, lies the rub—as I take it. It is not with the chatter of the flippant, the 'society' talk of idle people, that we are now concerned. It is with some of the most thoughtful and conscientious amongst us, who are asking whether the current notions of religion and morality are valid, and can avail for purpose and direction in a man's course of life as of old. Such persons see clearly enough that there has been a great 'revival' of fervour and activity in the Church—a 'movement' whose force does not appear to have spent itself yet. What is not so clear as they wish to see it is whether religion and morality, as they have come down to us, can meet the new knowledge, and new conclusions from new knowledge, of the present day, and maintain their own due supremacy intact. If they cannot, the multiplication and fervour of religious observances, and the activity of religious persons in charitable and philanthropic undertakings, will not avail. The sceptre will pass—slowly but surely—from a religion and morality whose standpoint is in an ideal world beyond this to a religion and morality grounded in and adapted solely to this world.

Y. If the 'revival' were merely in respect of the external activities that you note I should agree with that forecast. For thought, as Carlyle said, in the last resort governs the world of men; it directs and controls their total force. As men think so they will, in the long run, act. But we claim that we have a revival of conviction, a ~~renewed sense~~ of the nearness of God, and of His participation in

Divine nature; a renewed belief in the reality of our Lord's mission, and of His claim on our allegiance, and of His clue for the labyrinth of modern speculative difficulties. Without this, indeed, the increase of activity in externals would be a vain show of life, a soulless ardour.

X. I do not expect *schöne Seelen* like you to agree with me. You have your own view of the phenomena of the day; it appears to be both honest and comforting. Happy for you that it is so! But there are others who can't help thinking that much, perhaps most of the old arguments in religion and morals do not go to what we now see to be the root of the matter. One of the great leaders of old Greek thought, as you will remember, cites the question, 'Is the holy man holy because he is loved of the gods? or is he loved of the gods because he is holy?' That is practically our question too, when stated in modern terms. Is there any 'right' and 'wrong' outside the experiences of human life here below or not? Now, when you speak as you do of 'progress towards a far-off goal,' you show your instinctive conclusion that religion and morality have their foundation and sanction out of this world; you show your conviction that the essence of the matter does not lie in the fact that God approves a good man's conduct because it is adapted to the exigencies of this life, but in the fact that a good man is good because he is approved of God—*i.e.* by supreme, absolute goodness beyond any that we know here. And your instinct is right—from your point of view. For if the *raison d'être* of our religion and morality, of right thinking and right doing, be indeed outside this world, if it belongs to the fundamental and eternal nature of things—in other words, to the character of the governing Power of the universe—then we must expect to see a purpose and progress toward a goal beyond this mortal scene in the evolution of human affairs.

Y. Exactly! That is just what I wished to urge. And that is why I claim that we 'rejoice, yea, and will rejoice' in the opening of a new century for our old planet.

X. But softly! you go too fast for me. How if our religion and morality, our 'right' and 'wrong,' be terms totally meaningless, apart from the exigencies of human life as we know it? How if the character of the 'governing Power' seem to have nothing whatever to say to them? Cast your comprehensive glance back to a time later than it looked back to when we began this conversation—to a time long after 'the planet had cooled into a coherent shape'—

Y. Why should you laugh at me?

X. I don't; but try and picture to yourself the time when 'dragons of the prime . . . tare each other in their slime.' That epoch ~~was~~ was a product of the energy, the directing will of the governing Power; was it not?

Y. We must suppose so, of course.

X. But what room was there for our 'right' and 'wrong' in such a world? or, consequently, in the character and nature of the governing Power that ordained it?

Y. I think—so far as I can think at all at this dizzy height—that the human mind must needs be hopelessly at fault in endeavour to frame definitions of God's essential nature, and its possible manifestations, in terms of our thought. You insist on looking back through untold æons of time, and say, 'Where was the character of your governing Power *then*?' much as people cast up the follies of a man's youth against him in his maturity. It is absurd. How can *we* pronounce upon primæval phenomena and the supreme Power's relation to them? upon the nature and character of Him who is the Reality behind all phenomena, while we are cognisant only of phenomena? of Him with whom 'it is always *Now*,' while we are unable to think except in the terms of time?

X. You state your case forcibly. But do you not see that in urging all this you must give up your claim for a supernatural, extra-mundane basis for morality? You cry, '*O altitudo!* His ways are past finding out; but they are clearly not our ways: He has nothing Himself to do with our Right and Wrong; they do not pertain to His character.' And note that we *need* not go back through untold æons to discern this dreary truth—if it be a truth. So far as we can draw any conclusion as to the character of the governing power, by observing the course of this world at the present moment *apart from the disturbing factor of the human will and affections*, it is the conclusion that that character is, not indeed immoral, but non-moral, according to our reckonings. Huxley's well-known phrase 'the cosmic process' indicates in convenient form the impression made upon competent observers, be they tender-hearted or stoutly indifferent, anxious or content. But, on the other hand, when you claim 'progress in religion or morals' you would, I apprehend, base your claim first of all upon the improvement in men's conceptions of God, of His character, and of the kind of worship and service acceptable to Him?

Y. Yes. And I suppose you will not disallow that. Surely if there is anything writ large in history, it is that our beliefs about God have grown nobler and tenderer in course even of the Christian ages; while as to comparison with the heathen, why, one has only to look at the old heathen conceptions of Divine character and Divine worship, as exemplified now by modern heathen peoples, to realise what a momentous change has been wrought in matter of religion for mankind at large.

X. I am not concerned to dispute all this—though I might remark, perhaps, in passing that I know of no 'nobler and tenderer' conceptions of God's character than are to be found in the old Hebrew prophets.

Y. Forecasts—anticipations—

X. Be it so; the important thing to notice now is that it is precisely because of the gradual assimilation of our idea of goodness in God and our idea of goodness in man (for that is what your phrase 'nobler and tenderer' implies), because of this, that you claim progress in religion. And yet in the next breath you are fain to admit that our ideas of goodness have no *locus standi* beyond this world—that we have no evidence that they belong to the fundamental and eternal nature of things, that is, to the character of the Power that governs the universe. The human mind has doubtless a marvellous power of entertaining together very quarrelsome inconsistencies; but I can't see how it can intelligently and with full perception hold these two without their coming to mortal combat.

Y. I beg you to note that I have never claimed progress in religion—in our ideas about God and our obligations to Him—except so far as under present conditions we are capable of apprehending His nature and character; that is to say, as far as He is concerned *with us*. I am quite unable to imagine—it seems to me folly to try to imagine—how He is concerned with other forms of life and other manifestations of energy than ours, as I said before.

X. But some of these 'other forms of life and other manifestations of energy' touch *our* lives at every turn; they embody the will of the governing Power towards *us* in a thousand ways. What are we to think concerning them? concerning that 'cosmic process' which is, for this world, in the nature of things? How are we to fit our thoughts of it with the 'nobler and tenderer' ideas of God's nature and character which have been evolved in men's hearts? The old heathen ideas about the Divine Power were much more consonant with the cosmic process than those which you applaud, and in which you find such encouraging progress. 'God's pleasure' was not with the heathen His '*good* pleasure'—it was quite as often evil. The only characteristic in which your improved, progressive idea of God touches the old is that of irresistible power; and that is the central characteristic, as we all know full well, of the cosmic process too. But in all other respects your idea of God, and consequently of religion, goes on diverging more and more from the conclusions which seem forced upon us by observation of the cosmic process. Moreover it is becoming increasingly difficult to keep the characteristic of irresistible power in your idea; for if God be almighty, why does He suffer this process to go on, which, it would seem, is essentially contradictory of His character and purpose, according to your improved conception of them? In short, the gulf gaps wider and wider—and you rejoice at that.

Y. My conviction is that we shall know hereafter how the gulf is bridged—how these incongruities are reconciled.

X. I congratulate you on your conviction—on having no pestilent demand to meet—

Are God and Nature then at strife,
That Nature lends such evil dreams ?

(By the way, I wonder how many readers of *In Memoriam* have chafed at the almost random touch allotted to that great dilemma—touched only to leave it with a 'Peace, come away'?) I congratulate you, I say—

Y. Indeed, it seems to me that it is only in such conviction of illumination hereafter that one can find peace now.

X. Doubtless, if we could all abandon ourselves to the 'leanings and leaps of the heart' we should choose to take our stand on your side of the gulf. For it is certain that that God, the idea of whom has been gradually evolved in our thought (culminating, I fully admit, in *Christian* thought), that God is lovable, worthy of all human reverence; while the Power, personal or impersonal, manifest in the cosmic process is not lovable, nor worthy of reverence distinctly human. But after all the question is not what men's hearts and affections incline to, but what is true.

Y. I should say both considerations enter into the case—or rather that one may aid in the discernment of the demands of the other—as I may try to indicate in my feeble way presently.

X. The question is, Will your improved conceptions of the nature, character, and purpose of the Supreme Power—upon which hang all your religion and morality—will these now, in popular phrase, hold water? Are they reasonably tenable, together with what we know of the order of the universe? Are we to reverence love, justice, self-offering, &c., and practise them ourselves—are we to live with constant reference to an hereafter of perfection in these virtues and graces—when they are contradicted by the whole drift of 'natural' life and cosmic energy, and when (what is equally momentous) we seem to be shut up in the whirling cycle of natural forces, and so shut off from all really noble progress; confined, every one of us, too, each to his little span of time, dominated by this same cosmic process?

Y. How could it be otherwise than that the truth of things is our one concern, whether it be painful or pleasant to us? But what I meant just now I may, perhaps, show best by repeating a phrase of yours which struck me before. You spoke of 'observing the course of the world'—of the cosmic process—'*apart from the disturbing factor of the human will and affections.*' Is not that 'disturbing factor' an element in the highest degree necessary to take into our calculation? Is not 'the human will and affections,' briefly, the highest product of energy—at once the most complex and the noblest result of the evolution of forces—of which we have cog-

nisance here? Must not *its* persistent needs and requirements, its continuous developments, afford, if there be any truth in the correlation of character and environment, the strongest presumption of the reality of the *pabulum* on which alone they can be fed? Or are its passionate longings, its ardent aspirations, its brave ventures only hanging, as it were, in the inane? baseless, fruitless?

X. There is, no doubt, a *presumption*—but no more. And there are great ugly facts that make against it.

Y. I do not believe that we can attain to more than a presumption in thinking of these things. *Conviction* belongs to another region—to the region of communion with the Father of spirits. I can't dare patter my poor words about that. But when the presumptions of our reason fairly meet the conviction of our heart, then, I think, we may take courage and face the cosmic process, and the seemingly endless whirl of pitiless 'Nature,' and hope, not foolishly, in the new time—ay, and in what is beyond time. After all, the basis of all religion and all morality for us is truth—reality—and in that virtue our idea of God and our observation of the cosmic process meet. Now forgive my poor attempts; I can only grope after my own meaning—let alone the gist of the matter.

X. Off! we are all gropers, and I like to grope in good company. And 'any way, the world must contrive to struggle on'—*nicht wahr?* Why, God bless me! the cosmic forces have run on to half-past six! Good-bye, good-bye, and a happy century to you!

THEO. CHAPMAN.

ENGLAND'S PEASANTRY—THEN AND NOW

WHEN the fifteenth century opened—though great social and economic changes had been at work up and down the land during two or three generations—our England was divided into some thousands of geographical areas, which were called *vills* or *townships*, (we call them now parishes), varying very greatly in extent; but each of these townships was not only a geographical, but a *civil*, an *ecclesiastical*, a *social*, and we may add a *political*, unit, enjoying a very large measure of self-government, and in many instances enjoying a kind of *constitution* of its own.

The inhabitants of these areas were *human*, and so they had their rivalries, their feuds, their quarrels, their fights, just as, I suppose, ants and beavers have among themselves; but nevertheless these people in the old townships managed their own affairs with surprisingly little friction, and, above all, they were unanimous in regarding the land comprehended in their several townships as, in some sense, the property not of one or two landlords, but as the property of all the members of the village community. The land comprised within the separate areas of the townships was divided into a countless number of tiny little strips and plots, tumbled about in the most confused manner. The tillage of the land was barbaric in the extreme, and though everybody had some little bit of arable or, it might be, pasture which he called his own, yet he could not even cultivate it as he pleased, so closely were the rights of his neighbour entangled with those of himself and everybody else. Moreover, the actual rights of *ownership* could only be made out with the greatest difficulty by the cunningest of the lawyers. And if it had been possible in those days for every rood of ground to maintain its man—as it certainly was not—it was still less possible for every man to maintain his rood when it became a question as to the tenure on which he held it.

For ages Lyttleton's terrible little book on tenures was the great authority for the lawyers to refer to, and a very, very, very stiff book it was. Think of a manual of theology, say only thirty times as long as the Thirty-nine Articles, and dealing with all the possible heresies that a man might fall into who aspired to be an orthodox

divine ! Think of the hopeless confusion we should most of us be in before we could be quite sure that we were not *Monotheletes*, *Monophysites* or *Supralapsarians* !

The first impression of a layman on reading Lyttelton and his commentators is that no man in England in the good old times—oh ! those delightful 'good old times' !—could have felt any certainty that there was a single acre, from the Land's End to John o' Groat's house, that he could safely call his own ! But that was not all. The dwellers in the various villis, or townships, or parishes, could hardly be sure of *themselves*. In respect of one plot of land he might call himself a free man ; but even so he was only a free *tenant*, having some annual money rent to pay to the lord of the manor. In respect of another strip, which he may have inherited from his mother's side of the house, he was bound to render certain *services* to the lord, such as helping to cart the said lord's hay for half a day in July, or provide a dozen of eggs at Lady Day or a hen—it would often enough be a tough one that was past laying—at Christmas.

On many large estates there are still survivals of these services and dues to be met with, though during the last twenty years they have largely disappeared, owing to what has been called the agricultural distress, which has prevailed so widely. The annual 'homage-turkeys' which the tenants on Lord Leicester's estates in Norfolk contributed some few years ago, and which I am inclined to think they still bring at the Christmas audit, constituted in the aggregate a money value by no means contemptible ; and the obligation to convey so many tons of coal to the capital mansion of many another estate, or to provide the carting of gravel or timber when required by the landlord, is still a custom on many a large property, and such services are, or were till very recently, imposed upon the tenants by clauses actually inserted in the leases. One of my earliest reminiscences goes back to more than sixty years ago, when as a child I went with my father to pay a visit to a tenant of his in Essex. For some reason or other the old farmer protested to his landlord, saying : ' Your honour needn't be afraid of me, sir. Me and my father has always kept the *best goose* for your honour and your father, and we ain't a-going to do other than fair now ! ' I remember the scene, and I remember the words, because my father often repeated them to me afterwards. The *best goose* was a customary service beyond the money rent paid for the farm.

On the other hand, as being supposed to bear their share in the common tillage of the open fields, and as a kind of equivalent for the services rendered to the lord of the manor, the tenants, whether their holdings were great or small, had certain rights of participation in the pasturage of the 'common fields,' and a limited usage of the 'waste lands,' which were supposed (though in many instances erroneously supposed) to belong to all the inhabitants of

the township. In many cases *customs* had grown up which strict law could not be found to sanction, and before the parishes were inclosed strict law was found in practice to be a great deal too costly to allow of its being often set in motion. A poor man's cow had the use of the common; sometimes, as now very frequently, he managed to keep a pony or a donkey, earning an honest penny by hawking or doing a little carrier's business where the roads admitted, and sometimes earning a rather less honest penny by cutting the turf or underwood, and selling it for kindling to the townsfolk five or six miles off, where faggots were scarce.

Sometimes another kept a small flock of geese, or managed to keep some cocks and hens, which had hard work to pick up a livelihood, and their owner had to look very sharp to defend them against the foxes and the weasels, and other 'warmint.' As for fuel, it may be taken almost as certain that in nothing were the old townships or parishes so entirely self-sufficing as in the one article of fuel. The English peasant, as a rule, literally had his fuel at his door, and paid nothing for it. In such districts as the Fen Country the peat bogs were practically inexhaustible, just as they appear to be in Galway and other parts of Ireland to-day. But everywhere the turf on the common was cut and stored as the people wanted it; the gorse and the heather were stacked for the oven or the hearth, and in some localities the cowdung was gathered by the children in the dry weather, and covered over with bracken or such shelter as they could get, for there was thrift everywhere.

Moreover, there were always a certain number, and, indeed, in many cases a very large number, of trees which grew on the balks or in the wastes, and which that aforesaid embryonic condition of the law which I have alluded to—to wit *custom*, local *custom*—declared might be lopped and topped, as the phrase was, by all the members of the community. These trees were seldom actually cut down—that was an offence which brought a man before the manor court; but as time went on they were hacked into all sorts of odd shapes by the favoured many, who began by cutting off the main leader of the tree, and then proceeded year by year to hack off the young branches as they became worth chopping at. These old pollards (or *doddles*, as we used to call them in Cambridgeshire) still survive in considerable numbers in some of our country parishes; they are the gnarled veterans who as they stand afford their silent testimony to the fact that in the ages before pit coal came into use for domestic purposes they were themselves the reserves from which the poor labourers drew when the scanty fire upon the hearth was low and the pot had to be kept boiling.

High farming and the inclosure of parishes have swept these curious and picturesque vegetable deformities from the face of the earth by tens of thousands. But they are not all gone, and I should

like to see an Act of Parliament passed to protect many of these *ancient monuments* from further destruction, in the same way as other and less beautiful monuments are protected by the Legislature.

Less than five miles from the town of East Dereham, in Norfolk, you may see a very remarkable collection of these pollards growing in an area of not more than two or three acres. The trees must certainly be from six to eight centuries old, and at a guess I should say there must be at least fifty of them.

For centuries the poor people of Elsing went on steadily hacking, *i.e.* 'lopping and topping,' these trees until the parish was inclosed; since then the old veterans have been left to grow their own way, and the grand vigour of these monarchs of the glen has asserted itself in making them as impressive a sight in their splendid old age as a man can well fix his eyes on. They are worth a trip to go and see—worth a long day's journey for those adventurous and indefatigable people who, when once they are mounted on their bicycles, are prepared at five minutes' notice to go everywhere or anywhere for a sight of the picturesque.

A rage for inclosing the old townships set in first in the latter half of the fifteenth century, and continued almost down to the seventeenth century. I have myself never found time to give much attention to that subject, but I have a suspicion—an ignorant suspicion, it may be—that the first inclosures were carried out with a great deal of injustice, not to say cruelty, towards the peasantry, and that the experiment of working the newly inclosed land by associations was done very clumsily. Professor Ashley, in his extremely valuable chapter on the Agrarian Revolution, has thrown out some interesting suggestions, but has not gone so much into details on the *modus operandi* as might be wished. However, the valuable map which he has constructed—assuming that it is based upon sufficient evidence, and Professor Ashley is a very learned and very painstaking historian—shows that the extent to which the inclosures were carried during this earlier period was very much greater than has usually been believed until quite recently.¹

Be that as it may, it is pretty certain that the inclosure of open parishes came to a stop about the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and did not begin again till quite late in the eighteenth century, but then it did begin in earnest.

The man who more than anyone else deserves the credit of having brought about the new agrarian revolution, and who really almost deserves to be called the pioneer of the new agriculture in England, was Arthur Young. I do not of course mean that there were not

¹ *An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory*, by W. J. Ashley, Professor of Economic History in Harvard University (Longmans, 1893), part ii. book ii. chap. iv.

intelligent and far-seeing farmers on a large scale who were before him in working intelligently at problems till then untried, making costly experiments on the improving of stock and the quality of soils, and in many ways giving a stimulus to the taste for high farming which became through them a fashionable occupation for men of capital at the end of the eighteenth century.² But it was through Arthur Young's indefatigable, persistent *agitation*, and his vehement invectives against the wastefulness of the old system, and his continual attacks upon the folly of letting things go on as they were, and against the sentimental advocates who were opposed to the inclosures, that he won the victories he did, and succeeded so well in exposing the ignorance of the majority. The Board of Agriculture was established in 1793 in great measure by his influence, and the General Inclosure Act, which was at last passed in 1801, may be said to have been his work.

Arthur Young was born in 1741. His father was a canon of Canterbury. He lost more than one fortune by his efforts to improve the farming of his time, and his works do not deserve the neglect into which they have fallen in our own day.

Arthur Young gave the best years of his life to preaching a crusade against the ruinously wasteful system of the open-field husbandry in the uninclosed parishes. In the country generally a feeling had been steadily growing, even from the beginning of the reign of George the Third, in favour of inclosures; but the main difficulty which had to be faced was the immense expense of getting a private Bill through Parliament, and the terrible fees which had to be paid to the army of pettifoggers interested in letting things go on undisturbed. At last the General Inclosure Act was passed, and in the next twenty years at least 3,000,000 acres of land were set free from the trammels which had tied the hands of agricultural reformers, and a vast proportion of these acres were in one way or another thrown upon the market.

The inevitable result followed. Wherever great reforms are brought about, and especially so when these reforms are carried out rapidly and on a large scale, much suffering is entailed upon those who lived by the abuses of the past; and not only by the abuses, but by the happy-go-lucky system which reform perforce abolishes.

In the case in point the sufferers were the old men, who could not adapt themselves to the new conditions; the small proprietors, who had little or no capital, and whose estates were for the most part heavily mortgaged; and, above all, the adventurous and sanguine ones, who threw themselves into the new farming without sufficient knowledge or intelligence, and who recklessly borrowed capital to

² See *The Pictures and Progress of English Farming*, by Rowland E. Prothero. Longmans, 1888.

engage in a business that they were ignorant of and had never learnt.

The result in the shape of the enormously increased productivity of the country was undeniable; but there were not wanting sagacious men who foresaw that this could not last. The close of the war in 1815 brought with it a severe depression in our trade and manufactures. The almost unparalleled visitation of floods and ruinously bad weather occasioned such a sudden and almost overwhelming collapse of English agriculture, and, indeed, such distress in all classes, as far surpassed anything that we can now have any conception of. A very fair sketch of the dreadful condition of the country in that year (1816) may be read in Mr. Spencer Walpole's first volume. There were very serious riots, but, with the exception of those in the Isle of Ely and the Eastern Counties (where it is to be remarked that the earliest inclosures on a large scale had been carried out at least two centuries before), the most serious and alarming disturbances were not agrarian. They were organised outbreaks among the colliers and ironworkers in Staffordshire and South Wales, the weavers in Notts and the great centres of manufacturing industries in Lancashire and the Midlands. How the agricultural labourers in the villages fared, and whether they suffered to anything like the extent that the labouring classes in the towns did, during this time of grievous misery and famine, there is much more evidence to produce than has yet been made public. Probably, too, a very different impression would be conveyed than that which has been arrived at by the study of the mountains of figures, and by the miles of statistics in the official returns of a thousand Blue Books.

Certainly the *traditions* of our country parishes (and such traditions deserve to be attended to with much more care than they have received)—the traditions, I say, point to the fact that during that terrible year, 1816, and in the years that followed, when among the townsmen and the colliers and the miners, and the manufacturing classes everywhere, there was something very like famine and starvation, there was nothing of the sort among the agricultural labourers. For twenty years I have been on the watch for any stories that could contradict this view. I am bound to say I have never heard *one*. I must have talked to scores and scores of men and women who were grown boys and girls, even men and women, before the battle of Waterloo. My own father was a somewhat active magistrate during those times and long before I was born; and I am convinced that there was among the labourers poverty and squalor and distress. But I am equally convinced that there was among the small farmers, hanging on to their lands by their eyelids, scarcely less poverty, anxiety, and difficulty in keeping the wolf from the door than among the labourers themselves. And when I have set myself to ask the question,

How, in the face of such a crisis as that of 1816, were the peasantry kept alive at all? I can find only one answer.

You may denounce Gilbert's Act of 1782 as much as you will. It was a monstrous fraud, if you like, whereby the immense majority of the peasantry of this country were reduced to the level of paupers; it was a gross injustice, whereby the wages paid by the farmer were supplemented by iniquitous levies made upon the tradesmen and the professional classes; it raised the aggregate of the poor rates from $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions in 1795 to the enormous sum of 8 millions in 1832, inso-much that with the population of 14,000,000 every man, woman and child in the country was paying sixpence a week to meet this single charge alone; and all this exclusive of the direct taxation, which in 1810 amounted to the portentous sum of over 60,000,000*l.* It was bad in principle, it was suicidal in its operation; *but it did keep the agricultural labourers alive; and, what is more, they increased and multiplied, and while the townsmen deteriorated in physique, the countrymen did not; amongst them there was no repression of their exuberant vitality.*

But were not their *wages* utterly inadequate to the support of their families? If you mean the wages paid in coin of the realm—yes! But remember that in the first forty years of this century, and before a reaping machine had been seen in our fields or a mowing machine had been used in our meadows, every woman that could stub up a thistle or tie up a sheaf, every child that could watch a cow, or scare the birds, or help in the gleaning, was a wage earner. Nowadays you may calculate to a nicety the money payment which the father of a family receives in the course of the year, and if you want to know it *really accurately* you may find it, *not* from the very reticent report of the labourer, who will give you the minimum, and less than the minimum, if you ask him, but from the farmers' books, which are far better and more closely kept than the average townsman can bring himself to believe. In the old days the whole population of a country parish turned out into the fields at harvest-time, even to the very sucking child whose mother was hard at work reaping with the sickle; and, indeed, only so could the harvest have been gathered in at all. In hay-time the baby was laid upon the haycock as the mother plied her rake. In the autumn mother and daughter of ten would follow the husband's steps as he dropped the seed into the holes which he 'dibbled' with the turn of the wrist and that primitive tool of his that only the old men know the use of now.

The gleaning-time was a time when even a small family could pick up corn enough to last them well over Christmas. The church bell used to berung morning and night, and none might dare to begin before others, nor stay at the gleaning work after the evening bell was sounded. All through the winter days the flails were going in the barns—there were no half-days then. The thresher did his *task*

work by the piece, and was a great deal too good a judge of a good or a bad crop to engage in a threshing job that would not pay for hard work. It was always a matter of bargain between the employers and the employed. Regular contracts were made for carrying out draining work. Bands of six or eight men, who were under the direction of a foreman, undertook to lay down the drains at a certain depth for a certain price the acre, and the labourer tried to scamp the work, while the farmer did his best to take advantage of the toilers. It was all human nature! The perquisites of the peasantry were endless. Milk for the herdsman; the horsehair plucked from the manes and tails of the horses for the team-man, a practice which, by the bye, was apt to run into a good deal of rascality now and then; small beer without stint when overtime had to be made; straw given gratis in cases where a pig was kept; allowances for food and drink when a waggon of corn had to be delivered at some town twelve or fifteen miles off, and an extra threepence if the carter got through the turnpike gate on his return journey before a second fee was chargeable to the gatekeeper. As to the shepherd, if he were a really good one, he might in a few years save a fair provision for old age, for it made a vast difference whether the flocks were managed well or ill in the lambing season. At sheep-washing time, too, and much more at the shearing time, there was always extra pay to the really clever hand, for while it lasts there is no labour harder than sheep washing, and an indifferent clipper may waste pounds of wool in a season.

These are all facts. You may question them if you like, or do the other thing, which is the easier method—say boldly you don't believe them; but there they are, and depend upon it no facts are so fallacious as mere figures.

On the other hand, it may be asked, How did the agricultural labourer live in respect to food and clothing in the first thirty years of this century. Well, undoubtedly his garments were of the scantiest, but they were much stouter and more lasting than now. I remember the late Professor Sedgwick telling us once, with his usual drollery and inimitable vivacity, how fierce an opposition there was on the part of the *dons* in Cambridge against undergraduates taking to wear *trousers*—I think it was about the year 1820 or a little later—and having the audacity to present themselves in hall clad in the new and unseemly costume. It was actually proposed that the markers should not mark any man as present who presumed to sit down to dinner in trousers. Alas! the insubordinate young gentlemen with their new fashions could not be repressed. Mrs. Partington's broom and slop-pail never can keep out the Atlantic! Of course, what the gentlefolks introduced, that the lower orders imitated; but trousers came in but slowly. The old breeches were, and are, a more convenient garment than the trouser, and to this day the *navvy* on the railroad ties his trousers tightly

round his legs below the knee, leaving a wasteful and lolloping fold of unnecessary corduroy to accumulate wet and dirt when he is digging in the slush over his ankles. The farm labourer in the old days had his stout breeches fastened round his waist with a strap. On his shoulders he wore a woollen shirt, which was made of homespun by his thrifty wife, who got the inferior wool at a very reduced price from the farmer. The women spun the yarn, and travelling weavers came and collected this yarn, sometimes giving an equivalent in the shape of coarse woven material, sometimes undertaking to bring back the yarn duly woven. The women made this up into the husband's and the children's clothing; rarely did any money pass between the parties concerned in these bargainings.

The skins of the dead lambs in the spring were the shepherd's perquisite and the tails that were lopped at docking time. I gather that long stockings were worn by very few labourers, except such as were rather of an ambitious turn of mind. Why should they be? Does the Highlander think it a disgrace to show his bare legs? "a

Over all was the grand old smock, reaching to the ankles, and a very picturesque and convenient and comfortable wrap it was. Of course it was laid upon the bed as a coverlet at night-time, and it lent itself to a considerable amount of competitive dandyism on Sundays at church. To provide shoes was the great difficulty, as it still is, among the peasantry. But in the case of the children it was hardly felt to be a difficulty at all, for the children went about without shoes and stockings as a rule; and as for ribbons and artificial flowers, which, of course, are a necessary of life among our rustic mothers and daughters nowadays, they were not so much as heard of sixty or seventy years ago.

As to the food, it consisted mainly of rye bread. A few months ago I tried to get some of the rye bread which one used to see frequently enough in Switzerland not so long ago, and which the peasantry in some parts of France still eat. I found it impossible to procure it from any chandler in London. Of course it is the fashion to lift up the hands and eyes in horror at the thought of men and women living upon rye bread and barley bread; but I have heard a prosperous farmer, some fifty years ago, stoutly maintaining that the old rye bread had 'a deal more heart in it than that there Frenchified white bread as a man has to swallow without chewing.' His notion was that wheat bread stood to rye bread in the same relation that claret stands to port: 'You don't get no forrarder with it!' Here again one cannot but remember that the bony Highlander is not supposed to be a weakling, and yet his oat porridge is his main support. In both cases, to the old English labourer as to the Scotchman, potatoes came in as a useful adjunct, wherewith to fill up the cavities; and if butcher's meat was to the country labourer only an occasional treat, yet the common domestic

pig was a very frequent friend in need, and the killing of a sheep at the farm, or the slaughter of a bullock, or the death of a cow or calf by accident, always meant that the labourers on the farm had some odds and ends of fleshly dainties. It might be tripe, or heart, or liver, or trotters, and now and then a shin of beef or the less luscious dainty of sheep's head! Buttermilk in the old days might be almost had by the children for the asking. In twenty years' time people will not know what buttermilk means—do they now? Have any of my readers been present at a Butter-making Class? The new churns and the modern separators are rapidly improving that off the face of the earth, and the people have got to think scorn of it.

Now, do not do me the injustice of thinking that I am by nature or inclination a *laudator temporis acti*. I am not the man to be looking for the golden age in the days gone by. God forbid! But I count it the worst form of scornful ingratitude to indulge in boastings over our advance by making the worst of the past, and speaking of the generations behind us as if they were conspicuous only for their ignorance, their grossness, their vices and their brutality.

For we throw out acclamations of self-thanking, self-admiring,

With—at every mile run faster—'O the wondrous, wondrous age!'

Little heeding if we work our *souls* as nobly as our iron,

Or if angels will commend us at the goal of pilgrimage!

No! no! There is no need to make the old days to be worse than they were because our own are the days of advance. But this is the strong impression that has forced itself upon me during more than twenty years' study of the social history of England in our closing nineteenth century—this, that the life of our country folk at the beginning of this century was not only a much happier life than any superficial retrospect would tend to represent it, but that the actual material condition of the agricultural labourers in the first forty years of that century was by no means so low and squalid and hopeless as some writers have pretended that it was. Further, I venture to affirm emphatically that the condition of the town population in England, morally, physically, religiously, and intellectually, during the first thirty years of this century appears to have been very, very much worse than that of the rural districts. It could not have been otherwise. The population of London from 1811 to 1821 increased by leaps and bounds beyond all precedent. Liverpool during the same period grew from 100,000 to 131,000 inhabitants. The increase of Manchester was even more rapid. Leeds, Newcastle, Macclesfield, Nottingham, and a host of other towns, gave employment to armies of labourers, for whom *no sort of provision was made, body or soul*. Birmingham as late as 1815 had no town hall, no corporation, and sent no member to Parliament.

According to Telford, the great engineer, who knew the place well, Birmingham was notorious for its ignorance and its barbarism. At Sunderland, at Blackburn, at Norwich, everywhere, in fact, where the increase of the population had quite outgrown the control of the magistrature, there were continued riots going on. At Nottingham the mob burnt the Castle and all its contents. At Derby they besieged the jail and released the prisoners. At Bristol the rioters had it all their own way, and deliberately burnt down every house in Queen Square, the Custom-house, and the Bishop's palace. So it was elsewhere. Remember that in all these large towns *the clergy were nowhere*. The parochial system, in so far as it was a religious organisation, had utterly broken down; two or three generations of poor creatures, at least, grew up in absolute heathenism. People may tell all sorts of queer stories about sporting parsons and pluralities and absenteeism. But it is no more than the truth that, if it had not been for the country clergy and their families in the villages, and the small band of earnest and devoted men, who were the salt of the earth, labouring in isolation here and there, the very existence of the Christian religion in this country would have been in danger. As to anything deserving the name of national education, it did not exist. The townsmen were absolutely without it for *at least* the first thirty years of the present century.

The National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Church of England was founded in 1809. It was a beginning; but what could it effect, even with the co-operation of the British and Foreign School Society—or, if you will, its honourable rivalry—to deal with the awful and tremendous mass of appalling ignorance which lay as a dense cloud over the ever-increasing masses of the wage-earners in the large towns? Up to this moment no really earnest and laborious study of the great Blue Book on the condition of education issued in 1819 has been made. I have always hoped to undertake this, but have never done more than turn over the pages. The impression left upon me has been that in the villages there was incomparably more provision for the education of the working classes than in the towns. In the town of Preston, with its 18,000 inhabitants, there were four schools, including two kept by women. In the county of Bedford—observe, a purely agricultural county—on the other hand, with a population of little more than 137,000, there were 134 schools all told—*i.e.* a school for almost every 1,000 of the population. Of these 46 were dames' schools in country villages. Look to it, you younger men and women; act upon my hint, and attack that big Blue Book vigorously with your eyes open, and keep yourselves from foregone conclusions and views and theories, which should be adopted only when you have earned the right to take up with such views and theories by diligently and ably examining the evidence which may present itself to

your hands. In the villages the dames' schools, as they were called, were able to a very great extent to give something like an elementary, or, if you prefer it, a rudimentary education to the children of the labourers.³ They would be, and they were, utterly unable to afford even rudimentary education to the masses.

There is only one more question which I have to ask, but as to which I have only a guess or two to offer as a substitute for the answer; for my weakness is to leave many questions unsolved in theology, in ethics, in economic and social history, for when a question is allowed to be an open question (in these matters) there is some hope of fruitful discussion and stimulating inquiry. When any science approaches the stage of dogma—dogma which is to be received as settled once for all—it has got to the stage where it is ceasing to be a living science at all.

Were the country folk in our English villages at the beginning of this century more, or less, content with their lot than they are to-day? Were they happier, or the reverse? To begin with, this is pretty certain, that they had very little thought of a higher life than that which they were living, but, such as it was, they made the most out of it—the most and the best of it.

The agricultural labourers of to-day are certainly better clad, more luxuriously fed, have far more leisure, are better educated, and are rapidly becoming better housed than their forefathers a century ago. And if these are the main constituents of happiness, then they are happier.

On the other hand, their grandfathers and great-grandfathers were much more gay and light-hearted than the moderns; they *enjoyed* their lives much more than their descendants do; they had incomparably more laughter, more amusement, more real delight in the labour of their hands; there was more love among them and less hate. The agricultural labourer had a bad drunken time between twenty or thirty years ago, and he has been growing out of that. A village sot is now a very rare bird, as rare as he was a hundred years ago. Then the *labourer* could not afford a drunken debauch—he had not the wherewithal. His master, the farmer, *did* drink, and sometimes deeply in the days when he was prospering. And for a few years after the rise of the labourer's wages, some twenty-five years ago, the labourer was the publican's friend. But hard-drinking has been steadily declining, and the habitual drunkard is looked upon as a coarse brute to be avoided. As to other vices, things are pretty much as they were; I am afraid rather worse than better.

Perhaps the saddest characteristic of the men of the present, as compared with the men of the past, is that the men of the past were certainly more self-dependent—I do not mean *independent*, in the

³ See Note, p. 28.

sense in which that word is used now—more resourceful, more kindly, courteous, and contented with their lot than their descendants are.

As for the outlook, that is not for me to deal with ; a man should never prophesy unless he is sure—that is, unless he knows.

Each age has something to learn from the past. And most of us have something to unlearn before we are qualified to teach.

As to forecasting the future, that is becoming more and more difficult, living at the ever-accelerating pace which we are compelled to keep up in our time.

I think I know something about the English peasantry of a century or two gone by.

I think I know just a little about the agricultural labourer nowadays. I bear him a genuine love, and feel with him a cordial sympathy ; and there is no knowing any men or any class of men whom we do not love and sympathise with.

But as to the agricultural labourer of the future, I am sometimes inclined to doubt seriously whether before another century has ended there will be any such thing as an agricultural labourer to know.

Note

While these pages are passing through the press a volume of *Notes on the History of the Church and Parish of Rattlesden, in the County of Suffolk*, by the Rev. J. R. Olorenshaw, assistant curate of the parish, comes into my hands. The following notes on the schools in this village of about 1,000 inhabitants during the first forty years of the nineteenth century are very suggestive. They illustrate the remarks in the text. It would be well if others would collect similar traditions of the way in which elementary education was carried on in our rural parishes long before anyone had begun to dream of 'National Education : '—

'Private schools were carried on in the parish in the earlier part of this century by different persons.

'A lame man, named Martin Wells, had a school in the Rectory, then otherwise unoccupied, about 1816-20, or later, and was succeeded by John Sadler.

'*The art of writing was taught in those days by means of a sand table.*

'John Ready also had a school about the same time or a little later, in one of the old cottages . . . adjoining the Rectory Paddock.

'Two brothers named Cooper kept a school . . . somewhere about 1820.

'Mrs. Dickerson, wife of the Baptist minister, had a private school about 1821

'A public school was held about 1837, or earlier, in a cottage on the Butts. . . . The boys attended school three days in the week and the girls three days

'The Rev. S. F. Page was curate in charge of the parish, and was instrumental in getting the school removed from the Butts to the old workhouse buildings.'

[The return, made in 1839 by Mr. Page, gave a total of 132 children with 160 at the Sunday school.]

AUGUSTUS JESSOPP.

THE ADMIRALTY AND SUBMARINE BOATS

IN an article which I had the privilege of contributing to this Review last year, I attempted to put together the facts available for the consideration of the question whether some provision for submarine boats ought to form part of our naval policy. I had, of course, no access to official documents, and I had not, nor have I now, the technical knowledge which would justify me in expressing an independent or personal opinion. In this last respect I am in the same position as members of the Board of Admiralty who have to decide the question in the first instance, and members of the House of Commons who have to settle it—if only by acquiescence—in the last result.

Both tribunals have been subjected to a 'sea change' since I wrote in the month of May. Of the changes in Parliament there is no need, and not much available material, for much to be said. The points worth noting, so far as the present subject is concerned, are these: With no apparent difference worth mentioning in the balance of parties, there has been an enormous change in the *personnel* of the House. The members on both sides, whether new or old, have been elected on an issue so narrow and so definite that they have a 'free hand' to an extent unparalleled in former Parliaments. The short session, just over, was long enough to convince some old hands that the new House is not disinclined to use its freedom—with results that may upset many orthodox calculations. And, finally, our international relations are such that more than ever the efficiency of the Navy has become our supreme national concern. With or without reason, the peoples of foreign countries have condemned our South African policy. The Governments have indeed observed a strict neutrality as between ourselves and our enemies in the field, but which of them abstains from making profit for itself out of our embarrassments? In a situation so serious, and so likely to become more serious, the new House of Commons may insist on knowing more than the last was able to learn about our policy as to many matters, submarine boats included.

The personal changes at the Admiralty are of more immediate importance. They have excited a good deal of surprised comment, and as yet they stand unexplained and inexplicable. A new Government, coming into office after years of opposition, must necessarily place many of its members in positions for which they have had no previous qualifying experience. This is one of the necessary evils of our Parliamentary system. But why should a Government, carrying over after a victory at the polls, make a clean sweep of such a department as the Admiralty? All the Parliamentary members of the Board have been removed, after five years' experience, to make room for entirely new men. It is not for me to suggest any comparison between the members of the old Board and their successors. One may, however, on general grounds, regret that it was not found convenient to retain for a Department so certain to be severely tested in the immediate future the long administrative experience of Mr. Goschen. On the other hand, it may be that the new Board will be conscious of having a free hand in matters as to which Mr. Goschen had laid down the lines of a decided policy. Two questions, both in the first instance questions for technical experts, but both of immense significance to the efficiency of the Navy, have come to the front in recent months. The controversy about water-tube boilers has for the time been postponed by the appointment of a Commission of experts on a scale leaving nothing to be desired. The other question, about submarine vessels, is in a less satisfactory condition.

In the article above referred to, I attempted to put together from the limited means at my disposal the facts relating to the policy of foreign navies, the opinions of the experts, and the attitude of our own Admiralty; and I suggested that the time had come when some definite declaration of our position ought to be made. I hoped that the next debate on the Navy Estimates would produce such a declaration.

On the 3rd of May the First Lord said that no experiments in submarine boats had yet been made by our own authorities, but 'the most careful and consecutive watch is being kept on such experiments as are being made by foreign Powers.' Six weeks later, in the debate on the Shipbuilding Vote, several members pressed the Admiralty to define its position. The First Lord's reply was:

The importance of submarine boats had been pointed out, and it had been said that it was their duty to make experiments. The nations which were likely to have the greatest use for these boats might gain from these experiments more than others. He did not propose to make publicly any declaration as to these boats. Of course he did not wish to encourage or discourage other nations, but he must ask the Committee to excuse him going into the question.

This somewhat cryptic utterance was the last word of the Admiralty in the old Parliament. But in the same debate a speech

of a very different tenor was made by the gentleman to whom in the new Parliament will fall the duty of introducing the Navy estimates. Mr. Arnold Forster said :

If in the matter of submarine boats the First Lord of the Admiralty had said that in the opinion of the engineering advisers of the Admiralty to design and work a submarine boat was so remote of accomplishment that there was no reasonable probability of being able to create it, he would have been slow to contradict him ; but that was not the line taken by him. The First Lord said that the Admiralty had not designed a submarine boat, and did not propose to design one, because such a boat would be the weapon of an inferior Power. But if it could be produced as a working article, the Power which possessed such an article would no longer be an inferior, but a superior power. We above all nations were exposed to the attacks of this engine. He submitted that it was not a satisfactory thing to stand by and allow others to carry out this problem without making some attempt to solve it for ourselves. He admitted the tendency of the Admiralty to follow and not to lead other great nations. He hoped that one of these days we should not follow just a little too late. If we had been compelled to learn our lesson with regard to ironclads, breechloaders, and armoured cruisers in the face of an active enemy, we should have experienced the same lesson which the Austrian army underwent in 1866 when they were compelled to learn the merits of the breech-loader by studying it on the field of battle. There was room for improvement in the attitude we had taken up in regard to submarine navigation.

During the short session of December the Admiralty was again questioned, and the reply was that 'the attention of the Admiralty had been called to the additional provision for submarine boats in the French naval programme, and a statement will be made when the estimates are laid before the House.'

The result, then, is that we are still in the position in which we were left by Mr. Goschen's last statement. We have to conclude that no experiments have been or will be made, and we are still without the explanations which many of us regard as too long delayed. All that we know is that three months hence the First Lord's statement will contain for the first time a reference to the topic.

In the meantime we receive little additional guidance from experts qualified or accustomed to offer advice to the nation on naval affairs. The *Naval Annual* for 1900, published since I last wrote, still maintains the non-committal attitude of recent years. But it contains the most complete description I have seen of the French *Narval*, the latest of the French types. She navigates, we are told, by steam on the surface, and by electricity below water. Her dimensions are stated to be : Displacement 106 tons ; length 111 feet 6 inches ; extreme beam 12 feet 4 inches. In the original project the boat was to have been propelled on the surface by steam machinery of 300 I.H.P., the stoking being with compressed coal ; but it was afterwards decided to supply liquid fuel, and finally an engine of 250 I.H.P. was adopted with multitubular boilers, having five injectors for stoking with heavy petroleum. This is

placed near the centre of the boat, while the electric machinery is further aft. The following are details of the speed and range of the boat: On the surface, 252 miles at a speed of 11 knots, with 23 hours' duration, or 624 miles at 8 knots, with 78 hours' duration; submerged, 25 miles at 8 knots, 72 miles at 5 knots. When navigating upon the surface, the petroleum motor will drive dynamos and recharge the accumulators, thus extending the range. She is double. The inner plating is thicker than the outer, and in the intervening space sea-water circulates freely, the object being to offer greater resistance to projectiles. The armament consists of four Whitehead torpedoes, and there are two Dszewiecki torpedo-tubes on each side and towards the upper part of the boat, which launch the torpedoes in the direction of the beam. 'Owing to faults developed in the *Narval*,' says the *Annual*, 'work on the *Sirène* and *Triton*, which are of the same class, was suspended at Cherbourg, and there will be no effort to multiply vessels of this type until entirely conclusive results have been obtained from the trials of the *Narval*.' The four boats to be built at Rochefort are said to be of a different design from that of the *Narval*. There is only a perfunctory reference to the American movement, and the writers in the *Naval Review* draw no conclusions whatsoever. It would almost appear that, as a speaker in the French Senate said the other day, 'the English do not like to speak about submarines.'

In the meantime we are acquiring additional information about French performances and proposals. The *Gustave Zède* was recently inspected by the Minister of Marine, and the following account of his visit is taken from the *Petit Havre*, as quoted in the *Times* of the 7th of November:

The Minister went on board from a steam launch and was accompanied by M. Cuvemet, Senator, Admiral Bienaimé, and some other officers. After they were all below, the manhole through which they had passed was closed, and the vessel was submerged. The operation took nine minutes, but it is said that it can be performed much more quickly when the boat is in movement. The submersion left visible a flag at each end and the tube of the periscope in the centre. The range of the periscope is very limited, but sufficient for a man with a practised eye who is familiar with the surroundings. The commander showed no hesitation in taking his craft out of the harbour into the open. The steam launch followed close in her wake. The submarine with her companion made the round of the warships lying in the roads. On her way she discharged one torpedo which did not go straight, but this is stated to have been the fault of the torpedo, and had nothing to do with the discharge. The boat was kept at a uniform depth throughout the run, her speed being nine knots. The Minister expressed himself satisfied with the performance.

As to French proposals, varying figures are given by various writers, but at the present moment the correct result appears to be as follows: A 'supplemental programme' has been, or is about to be, authorised which, we are told, appropriates a fixed sum to be expended

on the construction of submarines, submersibles, and torpedo-boats to be constructed within the period ending the 1st of January, 1907, but without indicating the number or the type. The 'original programme' had authorised an expenditure of 68,300,000 francs for the building of 112 torpedo-boats and 26 submarine boats. The latter were to be begun in the following order: 2 in 1900, 8 in 1901, 8 in 1902, and 8 in 1903. The Chamber has now voted a supplementary credit of 50 million francs, which is expected to provide for the construction of 49 torpedo-boats and 18 submarines; of the submarines, 4 are to be begun in 1901, 8 in 1904, and 6 in 1905. Provision is thus made for the building of 44 new submarine and submersible boats, all of which, it is said, ought to be completed before the end of the year 1906. In addition, therefore, to an anticipated flotilla of 300 torpedo-boats ready for service on the date mentioned, the last French programme appears to contemplate a total of 56 submarines or submersibles, of which 4 are already completed, 2 are under trials, 6 are to be completed in 1901, 2 in 1902, and 42 in the period between 1902 and 1906.¹

The object of these remarkable preparations appears only too clearly in the Parliamentary debates. The Senate discussed the proposed increase of the Fleet on the 4th of December. A good deal has been heard of that sitting in this country, for it was then that General Mercier delivered a now notorious speech. But General Mercier's fantastic schemes are of little significance when compared with the calm and universal assumption that England is the enemy, and that it is only common prudence to prepare for a naval war with England. And in that war submarines are to play an important part. Nor is the public confidence in the submarine weakened by a frank recognition of its present limitations. The general sense of the French debates appears to me to be well expressed by the Reporter in the following words.

A l'heure actuelle nous sommes certes tous partisans du sous-marin; j'en suis aussi partisan que quiconque, mais il faut reconnaître qu'il est un peu trop encore le bateau de l'avenir. En attendant qu'il puisse faire disparaître tous les cuirassés il faut bien reconnaître qu'actuellement le sous-marin est une arme dont on ne peut encore être sûr, ou du moins dont on ne peut se servir que dans des circonstances spéciales. Du moment où ces armes nouvelles qui seront, je le répète, celles de l'avenir—nous n'en savons pourtant rien encore—ne sont pas les armes effectives actuelles, il n'y a qu'une chose à faire, c'est d'accepter ce que demande le conseil de la marine et d'attendre, pour substituer aux armes que vous demande la marine des engins nouveaux, que l'avenir leur ait donné la force et la valeur que certains veulent déjà leur attribuer.²

Finally, according to the Paris correspondent of the *Morning Leader*, M. Lockroy contemplates the use of submarines as *transports* for the English invasion, just as Mr. Holland, in the article referred to below, predicts that they will in a short time become the

¹ *Petit Parisien*, the 13th of December, 1900.

² *Journal Officiel*. Debate in the Senate, the 4th of December, 1900.

regular vehicle for the ordinary cross-channel traffic in time of peace. M. Lockroy's idea of invading England is neither Bonaparte's nor General Mercier's. 'Submarines of the *Gustave Zède* type,' he says, 'but of three times the tonnage of the present ones, would be the best means of transport; for it would be practically impossible, owing to the difficulty of illuminating the water under the surface, to make submarine destroyers.' But he reassures us by the observation that 'England would begin to fortify her coasts directly France put such submarines on the stocks.'³ Possibly Mr. Holland's prediction inspired M. Lockroy's theory, but the parallelism at any rate is curious and instructive.

Next to, or even more than, the French, the American type, as represented in the *Holland*, has attracted public attention in this country. The Chief Constructor of the United States Navy has recently published a valuable paper in which the history of submarine experiment and its present results are clearly set forth. In the opinion of this high authority many of the *desiderata* are impossible, according to the showing made by the *Holland*, which is undoubtedly the most advanced example. Speed equal to that of the fastest torpedo-boat, great radius of action, power of directing the course by vision against a moving object while remaining invisible below the surface, habitability for great length of time, unlimited quantities of air for power and respiration—all these, according to Admiral Hichborn, are unattainable, and will not be attained until some new way of acquiring power be discovered and until startling discoveries in chemistry be made. But his analysis of the positive and negative efficiencies of the *Holland*, in respect of radius of action, surface and submerged speed, control and direction in the vertical and horizontal plane, ventilation, field of vision, armament and protection, surface and submerged motive power, &c., yields a large positive quantity. 'Its capability for performing certain well-defined duties seems to be as well fixed by official trials as are the capabilities of other types of vessels in their trials. The securing of our coasts, so that our fleet may be free to do its legitimate offensive work, is a most important duty. Can submarines do it? I never heard a naval man of any nationality express the opinion that any battleship in the world could prevent, by her gun-fire or otherwise, the approach of a submarine of the efficiency of the *Holland*, although many who have not seen her are quite positive that she cannot do what she does do and has been reported as doing by a most careful board of officers.'

Admiral Hichborn writes primarily with reference to the needs of his country, and his conclusion, after examining all the conditions and allowing for less than the efficiency shown on the official trials, is that 'submarines can secure our coasts more perfectly than they can be secured in any other way at present practicable.' And he adds

³ *Morning Leader*, the 25th of December, 1900.

some reflections from another point of view which may strike some of us as even more suggestive. 'As a designer of ships,' he says, 'the economy in leading other nations in the adoption of submarines appeals to me strongly. As soon as any particular kind of fighting craft appears in numbers sufficiently large to make the effect of that kind felt, it forces great modifications upon existing types. Whether devices can be invented whereby battleships can meet submarines, or whether they will continue to be vulnerable to off-shore attacks as now, certain it is that the general appearance of submarines will force important modifications in design, and certain it is that the first country to accept the modifications will enjoy great comparative advantage in saving in her annual Budget.'⁴

Less authoritative than Admiral Highborn's paper, but of more popular interest, is an article contributed by another American writer, Mr. Kimball, to the September number of *Harper's Magazine*. In Mr. Kimball's opinion—

The submarine has arrived. The recognition of her capabilities within her limited field of usefulness cannot be much longer delayed. France has grasped the idea of the effectiveness of the type in general, and has so far developed it that she has a dozen submarines on her naval register, and has provided for thirty-eight, all told. When she has employed them for coast defence sufficiently to make their potential felt it will be apparent that she will be able to send her whole cruising fleet against an enemy's ships, ports, or lines of communication. Other civilised nations will then be found to follow her lead, as they did in the matter of torpedo-boats.

In one passage the writer appears to think that the silence of the British authorities is due to a desire to impede the development of the idea, and so to avoid the expenditure which its success would necessitate. But Mr. Kimball is clearly of opinion that we, too, must submit to the inevitable:

Great Britain was forced to meet the inexpensive torpedo-boat with the expensive torpedo-boat destroyer, and she will be forced to meet the submarine in some way not at present apparent. She accepts the truism that the best coast defence is the energetic attack of the enemy's coast, and accordingly directs her policy towards the increase of her offensive military sea-power. But she continues to provide shore fortifications and mobile sea-defences for the security of her wealth centres and strategic positions, and, as the most practicable feature for these last, she will provide submarines when other nations have brought them forward.

Still more impressive are the statements made by the inventor of the *Holland* itself. In a remarkable article in last month's *North American Review* Mr. Holland draws a short and vivid sketch of the place he anticipates for the submarine in war and in peace. With the commercial possibilities of the submarine we are not now concerned; the warlike efficiency, even at the present stage of development, is

⁴ 'The Demonstrated Success of the Submarine Boat.' By Admiral Philip Highborn. *Engineering Magazine*, June 1900.

formidable indeed, and in one important respect is likely to receive an immediate increase. There is, according to Mr. Holland, no defence possible against the existing type. 'The submarine is indeed a sea-devil against which no means that we possess at present can prevail.' Again: 'You can send nothing against a submarine boat—not even itself. You cannot defend yourself against an attack under water except by running away. Wharves, shipping at anchor, the buildings in seaport towns, cannot run away. Therefore the sending of a submarine against them means their inevitable destruction.' And Mr. Holland does not hesitate to predict that nations with seaport towns will have to refrain from making war altogether unless the ingenuity of inventors comes to the rescue.

The most striking thing, however, in this article is the positive statement that a new submarine is about to cross the Atlantic entirely under her own power. She is to go first to Bermuda (676 miles), then to Fayal (1,880 miles), thence to Lisbon (940 miles), and she could just as easily do the whole distance of nearly 3,500 miles without any break at all. This, we presume, is the third and most advanced stage of the *Holland* type. If the result of the experiments justifies the inventor's confidence, there will be an end of the weightiest plea in the argument against the submarine. It will be no longer possible to pretend that they are 'weapons of coast defence' only.

If the *Daily Chronicle's* Washington correspondent is right, a supplemental submarine programme is about to be proposed in the United States. 'Congress,' he says, 'will be asked during the present Session to authorise additional submarine torpedo-boats. There are seven boats now under construction. The new vessels are to be slightly larger than those now building, and have an increased radius of action. They will carry five instead of three torpedoes.' He takes the responsibility of adding that the naval officers who have been studying the question have become convinced 'that submarine boats will prove one of the decisive factors in future wars.'⁵

What, then, is the situation as it appears to persons without special knowledge or preconceived opinions—unacquainted either with the policy of the Admiralty or the designs of inventors? We see that the United States, which fifteen years ago could come to no conclusion because the question was in an experimental stage,⁶ are now in possession of the finest specimen of the type yet devised, and are making it part of their naval equipment. The opinions of naval officers and the interests of battleship-builders have, we are told, blocked the way, but have not prevailed. France, which led from the first, has still the lead in the number of submarines built,

⁵ *Daily Chronicle*, the 24th of December, 1900.

⁶ The Board of Fortifications and Defences reported in 1886 that 'submarine boats have not passed the experimental stage,' and declined to make any recommendation.

building, or financially provided for. Other nations are following suit—even some not named in this or in any other paper that I have seen—and that on the advice of English experts. In this country we have not as yet been permitted to know what our policy is, or whether we have a policy. Russia, it is said, keeps her doings secret, but such a course is impossible in this country. Until some financial provision is made in the programme attached to the Navy Estimates we know that nothing is being done beyond inquiry, and possibly experiment. A few weeks ago some of the newspapers reported that experiments had been begun, but the statement does not appear to have been authorised, and has not been confirmed. Until Parliament meets again in February we are not likely to have any official announcement on the subject. I am the last person who would desire to take the decision of such a question out of the hands of the Admiralty, or to use any pressure to force them to a premature decision. But no decision can now be described as premature. The question has been before them for many years. They must by this time be in a position to tell us authoritatively whether the submarine vessels have any value for ourselves or for our possible enemies, and if for the latter only, how we are to countervail them. The most satisfactory assurance we could receive from the Admiralty would be that the submarine is, as many persons in this country still maintain, an expensive toy, which is dangerous only to its owners. But in the face of the huge provision made by France, and the considerable provision made by the United States, it is difficult to believe that any such assurance can be forthcoming. There is really nothing in the recorded opinions of private experts which can be set against the conclusions of the Chief Constructor of the United States Navy or the positive statements of Mr. Holland. At the present time our military misfortunes have shaken public confidence in all our great departments, and continued reticence on a subject which has excited so much curiosity and apprehension would, I venture to think, be a mistake. If not before Parliament meets, at all events then, the new Admiralty, it is to be hoped, will take the country into its confidence.

EDMUND ROBERTSON.

THORNEYCROFT'S MOUNTED INFANTRY ON SPION KOP

‘Varus, Varus, give me back my legions.’

By the 21st of January it had become evident that the high hill of Intawanyama or Spion Kop was the key of the Boer position, and that whoever held that commanding height held the road to Ladysmith. An assault on this hill was planned, and Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry, on account of their local knowledge, were selected to supply a detachment to the attacking force. The attempt was to be made on the night of the 22nd, but, in answer to a suggestion of Colonel Thorneycroft, the General decided that it should be postponed until a thorough reconnaissance of the hill had been made.

With this object General Warren went out on the morning of the 23rd.

Of the two routes to the summit, that which started from the direction of Trichardt's Drift was the one which at first recommended itself to the General, for it was not exposed to view or fire from the enemy—while the other route over the south-western face of the mountain was visible from the Boer positions. General Warren, accompanied by some of his staff, reconnoitred the route from the side of Trichardt's Drift; but, when later in the day General Woodgate was placed in command of the enterprise, it was decided to climb the hill from the south-western slopes.

On the afternoon of the 23rd the camp was moved and preparations were made for a rendezvous in the evening to assault Spion Kop from the direction of Trichardt's Drift: that is, from the south-eastern side of the mountain. It was not until seven o'clock at night that the word came that General Woodgate had decided to attack Spion Kop from the other side: that is, from the south-western side of the mountain.

Colonel Thorneycroft rode out from camp at once, and the rough sketch and the hasty notes which he was then able to make in the fleeting moments of dusk afforded the sole information as to the route up the hill which the column possessed.

He noted the landmarks—first two ‘dongas,’ then a little to the

left hand a third—then straight up and a cluster of kraals—then up again and two trees—up again and two more trees, then a plateau, some steep rocks, some more trees, and a smooth green 'glacis'—then a belt of trees, and after that straight over the open to the top. Also a long donga seemed to run rectangularly up the mountain on the right hand of a column passing by the kraals and the other landmarks, while on the left would be a gully or 'couloir' which appeared to run down the mountain.

It was six o'clock on a warm cloudy evening when, leaving their horses in camp, 180 men and eighteen officers of Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry set out for the rendezvous.

The meeting-place was at the mouth of a long glen, which led to the base of the hill, and was near the main camp of General Warren's force. Here the men halted, and their Colonel spoke a few words to them. 'The honour of the regiment was in the hands of the men involved in this enterprise,' he said, 'and he knew he could trust them all to do their duty.'

Absolute silence must be kept, and no lights must be struck. When the top was reached there was to be no firing; the bayonet only was to be used.

At about half-past ten the column had assembled. It was composed of the Royal Lancaster Regiment, the Lancashire Fusiliers, two companies of the South Lancashire Regiment, and Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry. It moved up the gully with the Lancashire Fusiliers leading.

When some half-mile had been traversed General Woodgate halted the leading battalion, and sent the mounted infantry ahead; and from that moment until the summit was reached the column was led by Colonel Thorneycroft, accompanied by Lieutenants Farquhar and Gordon Forbes, and Privates Shaw and Macadam, with 183 officers and men of their regiment behind them. Kaffir paths were followed leading to the kraals, which, being beyond the dongas and the broken ground at the base of the hill, and being on the hill itself, were the first and most important landmark of all. Near the foot of the hill a short halt was made, and scouts were sent out to find the kraals, which the column reached a little after midnight. Here the difficulty of the ascent began: huge boulders lie hidden in the grass all along this side of Spion Kop, and the steepness and roughness of the route increased as the column ascended. The first clump of trees came in sight (the second of the Colonel's landmarks). The mountain seemed to change its shape: the sketch and the notes of the route had been made from a distance and in a few minutes of waning light. The long donga, which had looked as if it ran straight up the hill, had disappeared; but the other landmarks were enough, and the Colonel and his four comrades pushed up to the second clump of trees, keeping the hollow on their left—

then on to the little plateau, then to the steep rocks, while the column behind plodded slowly up over the grass slopes and the boulders. No man spoke; orders and messages were whispered. Halts were made for the column to close up, but the formation ('double files') was well kept, and touch was maintained throughout.

A few yards from the column not a sound could be heard except the muffled rattling of boots against the rocks.

Above the steep rocks (so steep that in many places the men had to use their hands) the hill flattened, as is the manner of South African hills, and here that thick mist which is not unusual in Natal in the rainy season settled on the hilltop, enveloping the column. The night was so dark that the fog could not render sight much more obscure, and the last of the landmarks were found—the green sloping 'glacis' and the belt of trees. Here the head of the column halted and a broader formation was taken up, Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry from this point upwards gradually coming into line as the ground permitted so as to sweep round the whole face of the hill and avoid all possibility of missing the Boer picket. Halt after halt was made in order that in the mist no mistake should occur as to the direction of the line, and that thus the column might be ensured against being fired on by the enemy's outpost from a flank—a contingency most unfavourable to any night attack.

As the hill opened and flattened, section after section was hurried up into line, until as they were reaching the summit almost the whole of the 'T.M.I.' was in the front line, with the remainder in rear, and the Lancashire Fusiliers, the Royal Lancaster Regiment, and two companies of the South Lancashire Regiment in successive lines.

And thus, in this order, with bayonets fixed, the column breasted the last slope of their long climb in the darkness, at a few minutes before 4 A.M. on the morning of the 24th of January. The continual halts, which had been inevitable so that their cohesion should be preserved and their direction maintained, had enabled every man to arrive at the top in full breath and strength. The silence was intense throughout—only the faint rumbling of the men's boots and the barking of some dogs near the kraals were audible. When they were some twenty yards below the skyline a loud ringing voice calling twice in quick succession 'Wie da?' pierced the stillness in which the column had surrounded itself throughout the long night. The Dutch sentry's challenge was heard by every man near the head of the column, and each will remember it while his life lasts. A second later and the whole picket of some twenty Boers fired heavily—their rifles flashing irregularly through the darkness—and the leading line, the 'T.M.I.' in obedience to an order given at the rendezvous, threw themselves on the ground. The firing lasted but a few moments, and then, when it seemed that the Dutchmen's

magazines had nearly been exhausted, Colonel Thorneycroft gave the order for his men to charge.

The word was caught up and passed from man to man with such rapidity that the order itself was drowned in the cry of the whole line—that fierce cry, half roar, half moan, which is called the cheer of the British soldier—and the whole line surged on to the summit together. Star shells fired from camp in answer to their cheers conveyed to the men on Spion Kop the congratulations and the joy of the army of Natal.

Now that the summit had been won, the general opinion amongst the men on the hill was that a bloodless victory had been gained. They thought that any resistance which might be subsequently made by the Boers would be silenced by our guns, which would assuredly be brought into position from some commanding ground in rear, or to left rear or right rear; that the holding of Spion Kop, which from below seemed a magnificent position for any army contemplating offensive tactics, would be the pivot on which a general movement would turn, and not that the little plateau on the top of the hill would be the cockpit in which a great battle was to be fought.

The truth was that neither from the British nor from the Dutch side of the hill could guns be fought from the summit, and thus that this commanding position could never be utilised to the utmost.¹ Had it been possible for the British to place and fight heavy artillery on Spion Kop, Ladysmith must have been relieved; had the Boers been able to fire heavy guns from that eminence, no further attack by the British on the range which runs from Acton Homes to Brakfontein would have been possible.

The task of the men on the hill now was to secure themselves as best they could during the short hour which intervened between 4.30 and daylight. The plateau was found to be some 900 yards broad by 500 long. No survey had been made of it in the long years of peace which preceded the war.

It was therefore impossible, without going over the ground, to know which positions commanded a field of fire, and the thick mist which enveloped the summit altogether precluded a study of the ground. The utmost that could be done was to fortify the ridge line. Picks and spades had been brought up the hill by the R.E. Company, but the ground was so hard and rocky that they could

¹ Extract from *Times*, the 4th of May, 1900. 'A Visit to Spion Kop:—'

'Wherever the Boers thought entrenchments would be of use to them, there they had dug them; but on Spion Kop—a most commanding position, from which, had they worked guns from it, they would have rendered Warren's crossing impossible—there was no trace of anything more than the slightest temporary breastwork, . . . and for this there can be but one reason, namely, that they recognised the hill to be untenable for attacker or defender.'

hardly be used at all. To a man standing on the crest line in that mist it seemed as if the ground beyond shelved gently away, affording a commanding field of fire. It was not until several hours later, when the fog disappeared, that it was seen that some 150 yards beyond the summit line the plateau broke sharply off, and that an enemy could, completely unseen, creep up to the rocks at the edge and pour in fire from the left front, from the front, and from the right front at this point-blank range upon the defenders of the actual crest line.

No man on the top of Spion Kop, in the conditions which obtained at 4.30 on the morning of the 24th of January, could know this peculiarity of the hill.

A narrow shelter trench was scraped along the ridge line, forming a protection sufficiently adequate against rifle fire from an enemy in front, but utterly inadequate as against shell fire. The only stones available for such a purpose were great boulders fast embedded in the hard ground, which could not be moved into position in the limited time before daylight.

The trench as it was when dawn broke measured from end to end about 200 yards, and towards its western end was slightly bent into an obtuse angle. It was facing what was thought to be the Boer position, and General Woodgate allotted to the corps their sections of the defences. Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry took up the left and the obtuse angle, on their right were the Lancashire Fusiliers, and to the right again was the Royal Lancaster Regiment.

The fog not merely rendered it impossible to select such defences as would command a field of fire: it made it utterly fruitless to attempt to see what lay beyond the actual hill itself, and thus to anticipate from which direction the enemy's fire would have to be encountered. Hence it was inevitable (considering the formidable positions held by the enemy all along the ridge of hills) that the defences of Spion Kop should prove to be enfiladed by the enemy's fire from some points. For the seizing of Spion Kop had, in a sense, cut the enemy's line. Had it been possible to retain the hill the entire Boer position must have become untenable; but the column which had carried the hill was now destined to meet an enemy which, everywhere entrenched, enveloped it on three sides—had now to struggle with the entire Boer force which, occupied with no other attack, turned its concentrated efforts to the task of driving General Woodgate's men off the narrow exposed hilltop.

Had Spion Kop been immediately used as a pivot upon which a general movement on the range had been made, the defenders of the hill would have been relieved. Forced to bear the brunt, hour after hour, of the concentrated attacks of an enveloping enemy, who was admirably protected by his defences, while they themselves were

completely exposed, the task of the men on Spion Kop—to hold their ground for the day—must not be called less than heroic.

It was forty minutes after the summit had been won when dawn began to break. A Boer field-cornet rode up in the half-light to inspect his picket. Not till he was within a few yards of the group of men scraping up the ground did he see his mistake. Then he turned sharply and kicked his pony into a gallop, while the men ran to their rifles and shot at him as he rode away. Scouts were pushed forward to the edge of the plateau, and a few ponies were found belonging to the Boer picket. The nature of the ground began to stand revealed, and it was evident that the true crest was not the highest line, but that 180 yards lower the hill broke precipitously off. A party of R.E. was pushed forward in order to make the crest line defensible, and a screen of outposts was sent to protect the working party. During these minutes there were several outbursts of rifle fire from the enemy. Work on the crest was about to be done, when at 7.30 the fog lifted and a heavy fire opened from the Boers, under which the working party and the outposts had to be withdrawn to the small wall and entrenchment 180 yards in their rear. The enemy's rifle fire immediately began to be very severe, especially from the trenches on the hill known as 'Green Hill' to the N.W., and almost simultaneously three guns and one 'pom-pom' opened fire from platforms cut in the side of this so-called 'Green Hill' at a range of about 3,000 yards. The enemy's trenches and gun emplacements were the result of many days' work. They had been made, not with the purpose of rendering Spion Kop untenable, but in order to bar the approach of any force about to relieve Ladysmith by the avenue afforded by the so-called Trichardt's Drift-Ladysmith road.

It at once became evident that the little wall and entrenchment afforded no adequate field of fire. Detachments were therefore sent out to the further crest in front—forty men under Captain Bettington and Lieutenant Grenfell going to the left, and some twenty, under Captains Petre and Knox-Gore and Lieutenant. F. Ellis, going to the left front. Detachments of the Lancashire Fusiliers went out to the right front, and of the Royal Lancaster Regiment to the right.

The remainder of Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry stayed in the entrenchment with their Colonel. It was a few minutes before eight o'clock when General Woodgate, accompanied by a staff officer, was walking around the hill. He came to the angle of the entrenchment at which Colonel Thorneycroft was, and someone reminded him that it was bad to walk about under the heavy fire. It was explained to him what measures had been taken for the defence of the hill. As the General was walking away he was mortally wounded in the head. The command then devolved on Colonel Crofton, Royal Lancaster Regiment.

At about eight o'clock the enemy's rifle and shell fire became more intense. The naval guns on 'Gun Hill' by Trichardt's Drift answered, but the Boer guns were so well masked under the sharp edge of the 'Green Hill' that the British shells never touched them. The wall of the 'Green Hill' was so steep that they either exploded against the hillside or flew over the hilltop and beyond.

In the front of the entrenchment on Spion Kop a long neck stretches slightly downhill, connecting the plateau with a steep rocky knoll, of which the summit is some 800 yards in a direct line from the British position. From trenches on this knoll the Boer riflemen were bringing heavy fire to bear on the little plateau of Spion Kop.

The ridge of this narrow neck, which, sloping gradually down and then up, connects Spion Kop with this knoll, could be covered by the fire of the outposts, but the sides of the neck and of the plateau of Spion Kop itself were so steep that no man on the summit of Spion Kop could see the Boers who, creeping along the precipitous mountain-sides, were, in complete cover, stalking up to the crest line; for the Boer fire was so intense that it was impossible for any man to stand up and look over the edge of the steep hill and live. The defenders of the advanced crest line were exposed to rifle fire from the 'Green Hill,' from the knoll, and from the slopes which stretch towards Brakfontein: that is, from their left front, front, right, and right rear.

By nine o'clock it had become clear that some Boers, creeping up through the blind ground along the sides of the neck and of the hill itself, were establishing themselves behind rocks on the edge of the plateau. These were being every moment reinforced, and were especially in growing numbers about the right front. Simultaneously the firing line on the crest kept calling for reinforcements, and as their cries reached the men behind the little wall, help was dribbled forward to them, and thus the strength of some sixty men in the firing line of the Mounted Infantry was maintained.

The Boers who had established themselves behind the rocks to the right front brought a deadly enfilade fire at short range on the men who were occupying the left front crest line. Of these the section of Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry under Lieutenants Hill-Trevor, and MacCorquodale² was the nearest to the enemy and the most exposed to the terrific flanking fire. All these men and their officers were at once killed. On the left of Hill-Trevor was Grenfell's section, and what these men saw is best described by Sergeant Just (T.M.I.), who was one of them. 'The fire now began to be something awful,' he says. 'It seemed as if nothing could

² Lieut. MacCorquodale had arrived at the front from England in the darkness of the 23rd of January, and was killed soon after daylight on the 24th.

live. Privates Kingsford and Warner were shot, two men whom their companions will long miss. Kingsford was a few yards off me on my left when I last saw him, smoking. Warner had just tied up a man's wound, and had scarcely done so when he was shot through the head. Lieutenant Grenfell was wounded in the leg, remarking to me, "That's all right, it's not much"; then, a few minutes afterwards, he was shot in the arm. I was just going to bind up his arm when, remembering that he had been shot by Boers who were creeping up to the right rear, Mr. Grenfell said, "I can get on all right, Sergeant Just; you shoot those men." I therefore went on shooting from behind a rock, and had fired three times when a bullet hit Lieutenant Grenfell in the head, killing him.*

Then Sergeant Just was himself hit by a shell in his side.

At about ten o'clock General Woodgate, though mortally wounded, sent his last message to General Warren. It was received by a certain Albert Large, marine signaller attached to the naval brigade detachment from H.M.S. *Terrible*, and was as follows:—"

'We are between a terrible cross-fire and can barely hold our own. Water is badly needed. Help us.'

At the word 'crossfire' the heliograph was smashed by a shell, but the signaller continued and finished the message with a flag—a perfectly accurate message, expressed in words as strong as those mistakenly attributed to Colonel Crofton a little later in the day (see below, p. 48).

About this time the cries of the men on the crest line for reinforcements became more frequent. Desperate shouts of 'Reinforce the right'—'Reinforce the left'—were borne back to the ears of their comrades in the entrenchment. It was evident that a certain stretch of rocks on the ridge line to the right front was unoccupied by our men, and that, if the Dutchmen succeeded in establishing themselves there, the positions of the right, the front, and the left front would become even more untenable. Lieutenant Sargeant, T.M.I. (Indian Staff Corps),³ was told to take twenty men of his company and to rush out and hold these rocks. The men rose and ran for their cover. They held their places there for some minutes, though but a few yards away from the enemy, who behind rocks on the crest line were pouring fire into them from their right. It is told in the regiment that Private Bradford ran for a rock and, raising himself, pushed his rifle over the top of it, preparing to shoot. As he did so, a Boer who had taken cover on the other side of the rock, and who was unaware of Bradford's presence, simultaneously put up his rifle to fire. The end of Bradford's rifle touched his enemy's breast, and, as he started with astonishment at the sudden sight, he unintentionally pulled the trigger and shot the Boer.

* Lieut. Sargeant died of cholera in India in July, on his way to rejoin his native regiment.

In a few minutes the Dutchmen, creeping round Lieutenant Sargeant's right in numbers, brought such a deadly fire to bear on him that he and his men were forced to fall back to the trench with a loss of half their number. The rocks at which they had been were immediately occupied by the Boers, who began to bring an intolerable cross-fire on to the men on the left of the crest line. Seeing this, Colonel Thorneycroft shouted that every available man left in the entrenchment and behind the wall was to charge with him. All that he had left were some twenty men of his own corps—the rest of the two hundred had all been dribbled out in sections to reinforce the firing line on the crest beyond. He had further some twenty men of the Lancashire Fusiliers, and at the head of this little band he ran out across the fire-zone towards the rocks beyond. As he ran he saw that a little to his left Captain Knox Gore and Lieutenant Flower Ellis were standing behind a rock on the crest line, firing! They had no one left living by them as they stood amidst the bodies of their men trying to keep down the flanking fire which raked them from their right. Knox Gore shouted to his Colonel, pointing to his right, but his words were inaudible in the uproar. Immediately afterwards he was shot dead. Flower Ellis still continued coolly firing from behind the rock, and was never afterwards seen alive. Near by Lieutenant Newnham, who had been hit in two places, was bleeding to death. He had propped himself on a rock, and was going on firing when a third bullet killed him. .

As the Colonel and the forty men behind him ran towards the rocks the fire they passed through was so intolerable that they dropped and shot just where they were in the open. In a few moments the Boer fire, turned upon them from right and left and from the front, had become so intense that the survivors began to dribble back to the trench, and the charge had fallen back. As he ran back Colonel Thorneycroft slipped and fell, twisting his knee, and those who saw it called to one another that he was dead. For many minutes he lay behind a stone, shouting to the men in the entrenchments that it was all right, and that he was well and would join them soon.

On the right front and right the men of the Royal Lancaster and Lancashire Fusiliers were also being dribbled out to reinforce the firing line on the crest. An officer of the Lancashire Fusiliers rose from the trench to lead his men—he was hit and fell dead. Lieutenant Wade (Lancaster Regiment) ran out to take his place, falling dead by his side.

Lieutenant Nixon, of the same regiment, thinking that Wade was merely wounded, rose to fetch him out of the fire-zone. As he reached him he was severely wounded, but kept strength enough to crawl back into the trench.

Major Ross, of the same regiment, had been left in the doctor's

hands in camp. He was suffering acutely from dysentery and unable to walk when the column marched up the hill on the night of the 23rd of January. Rumours of the desperate conflict in which his regiment was involved must have reached the hospital tent in which the sick man lay, for at three o'clock that afternoon the orderly reported that his bed was empty. How his gallant spirit drove his weak body up the long climb, across the lead-swept plateau, and into the firing line no man knows, for none then saw him; but at dusk his body was found on the crest where his company had struggled through the day.

At about 10.30 Colonel Crofton, who had taken the General's place, gave the following message to the signalling officer, Captain Martin (Royal Lancaster Regiment):— 'General Woodgate killed; reinforcements urgently needed.' This wording of a message which correctly described the situation is certified both by Colonel Crofton and by Captain Martin themselves. It was not written down, owing to the exigencies of the moment, and was apparently altered in transmission, for the above was not the wording of the message which General Warren is said to have received.⁴

At about a quarter to twelve the situation was extremely critical. The enemy had established themselves on the crest line along the centre and on the right, and the survivors of Captain Petre's men were in an impossible position. They fell back to some rocks midway between their original position and the entrenchment. Their places on the crest line were at once filled by Boers, and the men in the entrenchment were fired on from their left front at a range of 150 yards. Here the Boers at once propped the body of one of the T.M.I. above the rocks, so as to misdirect our fire. All the time the guns on 'Green Hill' raked the little plateau of the flat-topped hill from end to end.

It was about this time, when Colonel Thorneycroft lay behind the entrenchment with some thirty men around him, that somebody said to him, 'Here's a messenger,' and a man ran up with his lips shaped to speak. He was shot dead through the eye, and fell across the Colonel's legs with his message undelivered. A few minutes after this Lieutenant Rose (Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry)⁵ crept up behind a rock close at hand and shouted through the uproar, 'Sir C. Warren has heliographed to say that you are in command. You are a General.' He added that the right was hard pressed, but that he had seen reinforcements on their way up the hill.

The Colonel sent him to order the first reinforcements to go to the right. This message from General Warren, not being written, admitted of misunderstanding. It was clear from it that Colonel

⁴ The message when received read as follows:— 'Reinforce at once or all is lost.'

⁵ Lieut. Rose died of enteric fever in March at Pietermaritzburg.

Thorneycroft was in command of Spion Kop; but it was not then made clear that he had been granted the rank of Brigadier-General.

The conflict raged as before. Only a stretch of some 150 yards now separated the men in the entrenchment from the Boers on the crest line. The raking fire from the guns on Green Hill and the belts of shells from the 'pom-poms,' the rifle fire from the knoll, from Green Hill, from Brakfontein, and from the crest line itself, made it impossible for any man to live except under cover, and turned the little plateau into a terrific fire-zone of such density as has never been surpassed in the history of war. Only those who were on Spion Kop know how ferocious can be the fire of a numerous enemy entrenched in commanding and enveloping positions, equipped with an untouched artillery admirably served, on to an open space crowded with defenders who are within the most effective range—only those men know how nerve-shattering are the influences of such a fire when protracted hour after hour.

Other troops have undoubtedly faced a fire of equal ferocity, but under other conditions. The Russians at Plevna, the Prussians at St. Privat, the Dervishes at Omdurman, were, according to the law of percentages, in greater physical danger; but their ordeal did not last for every minute of a long summer day. Moreover, to move forward and attack is less trying to a man than to lie still and try to stop wondering, not whether he can escape death, but for how many more seconds he can possibly live.

Colonel Crofton was in the right-hand end of the trench. He saw a company of the South Lancashire Regiment running back from the crest towards him. He rose and screamed to their officer, 'What on earth are you doing? Advance, sir, advance.' The officer answered that the Boers were creeping up close to the crest line and 'were about to surrender.' As he spoke a young bugler who happened to be standing near Colonel Crofton and who had heard the words spoken, without any order given, stood upright and sounded the 'advance,' which, clearly heard above the uproar, carried the whole company back into its position on the crest.

It was one o'clock. A soldier near to Colonel Thorneycroft in the angle of the entrenchment drew his attention to some movement which was going on on the right of the entrenchment, some fifty yards away. The stretch of wall in between was unoccupied. The soldier said, 'By God, they're surrendering!' and this was what was happening:—About forty men of mixed regiments (amongst whom was no man of the Mounted Infantry) were standing up in the entrenchment with their empty arms raised. Their rifles lay at their feet, and their hands were in the air, while coming up the slope towards them were three Boers. Other Boers were following these behind. The three in front turned and beckoned to their comrades to come on, and all were waving small pocket-handkerchiefs.

The leader of the Boers was only about thirty yards away from Colonel Thorneycroft. He was a Transvaaler, by name de Kock, and I continue the story of what then happened as he himself described it to a British officer in the Biggarsberg laager in April.

'We had got up and we should have had the whole hill,' he said; 'the English were about to surrender, and we were all coming up, when a great big, angry, red-faced soldier ran out of the trench on our right and screamed out, "I'm the Commandant here: take your men back to h—ll, sir; there's no surrender;" and then there was ten minutes mêlée.'

It was just such a trick as the Boers love. Profiting by the shattered *morale* of a small body of men who had lost their officers, the Boers were hoping to start a discussion, and gain time for more and more men to creep up into the 'dead' ground behind them.

The 'great big soldier' was Colonel Thorneycroft, who, grasping the situation, ran forward to the Boer and then back to his men. He called to the thirty men remaining with him in the trench to follow instantly whatever he did, and 'not to hesitate a second.' Then, to use the words of one of them, 'having made up their minds to clear, they cleared,' and the little band rushed back across the open ground to the big rocks at the other end of the plateau, which stand above where the 'dressing station' was, leaving the Boers and their crowd of prisoners behind them, while the Boers were not so much engaged in the discussion as to lose the opportunity of shooting at the men of Thorneycroft's Mounted Infantry as they 'cleared' across the open at thirty yards range.

Then, behind the shelter of the great boulders above the 'dressing station,' the men were re-formed, and faced about and swept the plateau with their fire. As they did so, the first company of reinforcements, the Middlesex Regiment, breasted the top of the hill. Shouting to these and to his own thirty men, Colonel Thorneycroft rushed them all across the plateau, reoccupying the entrenchment and the crest line beyond, the Boers retiring down the hill with their prisoners.

The men on the left of the crest line had, alone of all those on the crest, been able to hold their ground throughout the day. They had been equally distant from their supports in the entrenchments, but their right had been protected by a fold in the ground which runs rectangularly from the crest line towards the entrenchment, and at about two o'clock they were reinforced by some of the Imperial Light Infantry.

The left of the crest was in no jeopardy, the front and right had been regained, and the commanding officer took up his position by a rock just in rear of the entrenchment, whence he could direct the flow of reinforcements which had now at last just begun to set in. Company after company of the Middlesex Regiment was sent to each threatened point, and thus the whole line was once again held.

It was about 2.30 P.M. It had become evident to the Dutch that although they might establish themselves on the crest line by creeping up through the 'dead' ground, still they could never in this way drive the English from the hilltop; for if our men had been again driven from the crest line and entrenchment, they could always occupy the rocks above the dressing station at the other end of the plateau—rocks which afforded an admirable protection and a good field of fire.

They saw that unless the English could be demoralised by shell fire they could never get the hill, and so from about 2.30 P.M. till dark they maintained a fierce effort to shell the troops off the hill.

Up to this time each man on the hilltop had been engaged in a desperate struggle to keep his ground. For the commanding officer, most of all, the conflict had been one into which all his thoughts and strength, all his soul and body, had been thrown; but now that some reinforcements had come, he had time to write a short despatch:—

Spion Kop, 2.30 P.M.

From Colonel Thorneycroft to Gen. Sir C. Warren.

Hung on till last extremity with the old force; some of the Middlesex are here now, and I have the Dorsets coming up, but the force is really inadequate to hold so large a perimeter. The enemy's guns to north-west sweep the whole of the top of the hill; they also have guns to east. Cannot you bring artillery fire to bear on the north-west guns? What reinforcements can you send to hold the hill to-night? We are badly in need of water. There are many killed and wounded. If you wish to really make a certainty of the hill for the night, you must send more infantry and attack the enemy's guns.

General Talbot Coke, part of whose brigade was on the hilltop, and who himself was by the trees on the hillside, stopped and read this despatch, and added the following:—

I have seen the above and have ordered the Scottish Rifles and the King's Royal Rifles to reinforce. The Middlesex Regiment, the Dorset Regiment, the Imperial Light Infantry have also gone up. Bethune's Mounted Infantry, 120 strong, also reinforced. We appear to be holding our own at present.

TALBOT COKE.

At about three o'clock the Scottish Rifles came up the hill, and were pushed up on the right and left flanks by companies as they arrived, and as they were required at the moment. For word kept coming to the commanding officer 'to reinforce the right,' or 'to reinforce the left,' and companies were directed to threatened points. It was impossible to keep regiments together.

Some discussion arose at this time as to who was in command of Spion Kop, for Colonel Cooke, of the Scottish Rifles, was senior to Colonel Thorneycroft. In order to settle this point Colonel Cooke went to find General Talbot Coke, whose brigade was now on the hill, and who was by the trees on the hillside. General Talbot Coke declared that Colonel Hill, of the Middlesex Regiment, was

in command, but very shortly afterwards it was ascertained for certain that Colonel Thorneycroft had been put in command of Spion Kop. To the reader the question of the command of the hill may appear a somewhat theoretical question; for it would seem that whoever was commanding the crest line and directing the reinforcements was holding the whole hill.

At about 3.30 the enemy opened fire from two guns and two 'pom-poms' from the Brakfontein hills to the east, thus sweeping the plateau from east and west and enfilading the trenches. From four o'clock to about 6.30, shells fell on the plateau at the rate of some seven per minute. Ammunition was continually distributed to the firing line on the crest, and many lives were lost in the task, but no further attempt was made by the Boers to rush the hill. The rifle fire was very close, and as intense as ever, but the Boers' chief hope seemed to be to shell the force off the hilltop. Moreover, it must be recorded that the men on the crest were fired on by mistake by one of our own field guns from the valley, which burst shrapnel amongst them for a considerable time.

At about four o'clock Colonel Bethune (16th Lancers), who was in camp in the valley, also sought to find Colonel Talbot Coke, in order that he might volunteer to take his men to assist Colonel Thorneycroft. He realised the desperate nature of the conflict which was raging on the little hilltop. The Tenth Brigade was by now on the summit of Spion Kop, and Colonel Bethune found General Coke by the trees on the hillside.

Towards sundown the men of the old force were completely exhausted. Since six on the night of the 23rd they had been continuously under arms; they had had absolutely no water and no food. Many of them had been served out with six-pound tins of beef the day before, which they could not carry up the hill, and had, with an improvidence frequently seen, thrown away. Of the lack of water General Woodgate had spoken as early as ten o'clock; a few tins of water had since then been brought up on the backs of mules. Of these more than half had been spilt, for the mules had fallen down the hillside; and the rest was inadequate for the hospital.

The intolerable strain of the shell fire and rifle fire had told on the stoutest. Amongst the prisoners taken by the Boers from the right of the entrenchment on Spion Kop was an officer. When he arrived in Pretoria on the following day his fellow-captives went out to meet him, anxious to get the news. One asked, 'How's my brother?' His answer was, 'DEAD.' Another asked, 'How is my brother?' His answer was, 'Dead, dead; everybody's dead; the British Army is all dead.' And for a month no other answer to every question put to him could an averagely sane and healthy and strong and brave young English officer give to all who spoke to him. Such had been the strain of the 24th of January.

Thornycroft's Mounted Infantry had lost more than half their number and more than three-fourths of their officers; and now the rest of the men were falling asleep from exhaustion where they lay behind the rocks, and many were slain and wounded while they slept.

At 6.30 Colonel Thornycroft sent the following despatch to General Warren :

The troops which marched up here last night are quite done up (the Lancashire Fusiliers, Royal Lancashire Regiment, and Thornycroft's Mounted Infantry). They have had no water, and ammunition is running short. I consider that even with the reinforcements which have arrived it is impossible to permanently hold this place so long as the enemy's guns can play on the hill. They have three long-range guns, three of shorter range, and several Maxim-Nordenfelts, which have swept the whole of the plateau since 8 A.M. I have not been able to ascertain the casualties, but they have been very heavy, especially in the regiments which came up last night. I request instructions as to what course I am to adopt. The enemy are now (6.30) firing heavily from both flanks (rifle, shell, and Nordenfelt), while a heavy rifle fire is being kept up on the front. It is all I can do to hold my own. If my casualties go on at the present rate, I shall barely hold out the night.

A large number of stretcher-bearers should be sent up, and also all the water possible.

The situation is critical.

As night closed in, some hour later, the commanding officer on the hilltop seems to have determined to come to some decision on his own part. He had held on throughout the day, hoping for the presence or the instructions of a superior officer. His men had done all that was humanly possible. Their conduct had been little short of heroic. No one could ask them to do more. Even their steadfastness, great as it had shown itself, could not stand the strain of another such day. Had the leaders on the hilltop been supported by the knowledge that some practical steps were being taken to help them with fresh troops, ammunition, water, and food, immediately the darkness fell, and that serviceable guns could be got up the hill in the night, then their decision would have been a different one from that which was inevitable in the circumstances. They had no such knowledge. No order or instruction or acknowledgment of his despatches seems to have reached the officer commanding throughout that long day, and no general officer other than General Woodgate had ever set foot upon the hilltop. Colonel Thornycroft summoned the senior officers to a consultation. It was held in the dark, in the hollow by the 'dressing station,' and lasted but three or four minutes. The commanding officer merely said : 'I should like to ask officers their views. It seems to me to be impossible to continue to hold on to the hill.' All expressed their agreement. There was no dissentient voice, and Colonel Thornycroft decided to retire.

It was known that one mountain battery was on its way up the hill, but it was clear to everyone on Spion Kop that this could never

live under the long-range fire of the Boer guns, and under the close rifle fire. Even the machine guns of the mounted infantry could not be brought into action, and never could be brought out of the cover by the 'dressing station.' If the fire was so hot that machine guns could not live, what would have become of even mountain guns, had they been sent up? The Boer artillery was placed in such positions that the fire of our big guns could not be brought to bear upon it from the lower slopes near General Warren's camp, and while it remained in these positions Spion Kop was untenable. In order to silence the Dutch guns it would be necessary that such a road should be made up the hill as would allow the passage of the naval guns from camp. It was the general opinion of officers on the hill that the making of such a road would have necessitated several days' work at the hands of a large number of sappers; and, at the lowest estimate, that ten to twelve hours of hard work would be needed before even a field gun could be brought up the hill. Now, the nearest gun of any weight was one naval twelve-pounder, which, according to the testimony of Lieutenant James, R.N., who was in charge of it, arrived at the drift near the base of the hill at midnight. That is to say, if it was to be of any service in next day's conflict, a road would have to be begun and finished, and the gun be dragged up in the five hours of darkness which remained, an achievement of an impossibility perfectly manifest to all who know the steepness of this side of the hill near its summit.⁶ But of the truth of this statement the hill itself affords the best evidence, and stands an incontestable argument which will long survive any controversy.

At about 11 P.M. Colonel Thorneycroft was walking round the crest line on the hilltop, and found one detachment of his men in the same position which they had held on the left throughout the day. He congratulated their officer, Captain Boyd Wilson, on being alive, and Captain Wilson asked him 'where the regiment was.' He answered, 'There's no regiment left, and we shall have to go down now.'

It were well to consider the resources of the commanding officer.

It was eleven o'clock at night; there was still no word from below; it was probable that if he remained he would have to fight as fiercely to-morrow, and in no better condition than he had fought to-day. The force was not equipped with entrenching tools. The ground was so rocky that it was impossible to make cover from shell fire with the ordinary picks and shovels; and, in the absence of any

⁶ Extract from log-book of Lieut. James, R.N., commanding naval guns:—
'On the 24th of January two naval 12-pounders arrived at the howitzer battery north of Trichard's Drift, about 6 P.M., and between 8.30 and 9 o'clock one gun went forward to just beyond, and close to, the last drift in front of Spion Kop, arriving there at 12 midnight.'

order or information from below, this was a most weighty consideration. The officer commanding must have felt that he had to rely entirely on his own resources for the next day, and that his own resources had become lamentably insufficient to meet the emergencies of another such day as the 24th of January had been.

Moreover, his other resources were exhausted—the strength of the men, their water and food. Ammunition also was running very short.

It was his duty to provide for the force for which he was responsible, and to contemplate as if it were a certainty having to pass through another day like the last. It is possible that the Boers may have withdrawn their laagers in consequence of the steadfastness with which Spion Kop was held; but no general retirement of their men took place. A few commandoes may have retreated in the night, but by the next day they were replaced by others of greater strength and their artillery was increased.

- When the troops had marched off, and at 11.30 P.M., came the very first and only message which Colonel Thorneycroft seems to have received throughout the whole day. It was brought by Mr. Winston Churchill, South African Light Horse, and was as follows:—

To General Thorneycroft.

Officer commanding troops will be glad to know through Lieut. Winston Churchill, S.A.L.H., who takes this note, what is your view of the situation, and what steps should be taken for the defence of the hill.

To which the following answer was given :

11.30 P.M.

Regret to report that I have been obliged to abandon Spion Kop, as the position became untenable. I have withdrawn the troops in regular order, and will report as soon as possible.⁷

To those who have followed this narrative it need not be said that

⁷ Extract from Gen. Sir R. Buller's despatch of the 30th of January:—

'I could see that our men on the top of Spion Kop had given way, and that efforts were being made to rally them. I telegraphed to Sir C. Warren :

"Unless you put some really good hard-fighting man in command on the top you will lose the hill. I suggest Thorneycroft."

... 'It is admitted by all that Colonel Thorneycroft acted with the greatest gallantry throughout the day, and really saved the situation. Preparations for the second day's defence should have been organised during the day and have been commenced at nightfall. As this was never done, I think Colonel Thorneycroft exercised a wise discretion (in withdrawing).'

General Buller's telegram, the 31st of January:—

'It is due to Colonel Thorneycroft to say that I believe his personal gallantry saved a difficult situation early on the 24th, and that under a loss of at least 40 per cent. he directed the defence with conspicuous courage and ability throughout the day.

'No blame whatever for the withdrawal is, in my opinion, attributable to him, and I think his conduct throughout was admirable.'

Extract from Lord Roberts's covering despatch of the 13th of February:—

'Major-General Coke appears to have left Spion Kop at 9.30 P.M. . . . yet almost

the impression that General Talbot Coke left Spion Kop at 9.30 P.M., and that immediately afterwards Colonel Thorneycroft issued an order to withdraw, is altogether mistaken.

Men have known hitherto but a vague and inaccurate story of the conflict on Spion Kop—a story supplied to them, for the most part, by newspaper correspondents, none of whom (with one exception) ascended the hill during the 24th of January.

Many of these men thought to give their readers the true story of this, the most desperate battle which has been fought by British troops in the last half-century, from the vantage-ground near camp some three miles distant. Equipped with telescopes and unbridled imaginations, and acting on the instincts of the journalist of to-day, they filled the gaps inevitable in their irresponsible narratives by questioning the wounded and laggard soldiers who dribbled down the hill—careless of accuracy, mindful only on the one hand of the limitations of the Censorship, and on the other of the craving for sensations of an unmilitary public, which when war is a new sensation loves to read and believe anything about war. It must be called deplorable that the good name of British officers should be in the hands of men so uneducated in military matters, so unscrupulous of accuracy.

L. OPPENHEIM.

immediately after Major-General Coke's departure Lieut.-Colonel Thorneycroft issued an order which upset the whole plan of operations.

'On the other hand, it is only right to state that Lieut.-Colonel Thorneycroft appears to have behaved in a very gallant manner throughout the day, and it is doubtless due in a great measure to his exertions and example that the troops continued to hold the summit of the hill till directed to retire.'

THE SCIENTIFIC USE OF HOSPITALS

EVERY medical student, both he who has had the pleasure of receiving a prize and he who has not been so fortunate, will doubtless agree with me when I say that much, very much, has to be learnt by him who is striving to join the medical profession. But that which such a one has learnt or is learning consists of things which are known; and before long, I trust, another thought will become uppermost in his mind—the vast extent of the unknown which has to become known, and which has to be learnt in order that the healing art may gain the reach and certitude of sway over disease which we all yearn for it to possess. Such a thought is always present in my own mind; and I trust that I am not doing amiss if I venture to dwell in these pages on another thought arising out of the former, and, like it, much in my mind—the thought, which takes the form of a complaint, that the advance of medical knowledge is not so rapid as it might be, by reason of the fact that in our hospitals adequate use is not made of the great opportunities which these offer for gathering in new medical truths.

Let me first say a word or two in order to disarm beforehand adverse criticism.

There are people, I am aware, who maintain that public charities, such as are our hospitals, ought not in any way to serve for the advancement of medical knowledge; and we hear again and again much misdirected talk against hospitals being used for the purposes of experiment. A certain amount of agitation is, in fact, going on under the influence of this idea. Such an agitation is, I venture to say, a mere ‘kicking against the pricks.’ Our hospitals always have been and always must be, from the very nature of things, the great means of advancing medical knowledge.

I ought to have no need to insist, were it not that they who fan the agitation I have just spoken of seem to need its being told, that whenever a sick person appeals to a healer for help, he, by the very act, makes himself the subject of an investigation. I ought to have no need to insist that every touch of the surgeon, every counsel of the physician, is by its very nature more or less ‘an experiment.’ For, on the one hand, he, the physician or surgeon, cannot be

absolutely sure of the result of his act; while, on the other hand, he is prepared to make use of the knowledge afforded by the result. And these two things constitute the very essence of a scientific experiment. The fact that the object of the act is not to advance knowledge but to bring relief to the individual patient does not make the act any the less an experiment; nor does it prevent the knowledge gained by the result being made of use to others.

In every case of treatment of the sick there is a factor of uncertainty, and this factor, by which each act of the healer becomes an 'experiment,' varies widely in different cases. It may be insignificant—it can never be wholly absent—or it may be considerable. How far the healer in any particular case ought to go in the direction of uncertainty must depend on the special circumstances of the case, and must be determined by one consideration alone—the welfare of the patient. Judged by this—by the welfare of the patient—it may in one case become the duty of the healer to plunge into the unknown guided by the slenderest clue; in another case he would be justly blamed if he swerved ever so little from the trodden path.

Thus every hospital, and indeed every consulting-room, is in reality, beyond all denial, the seat day after day of a continued series of experiments, each conducted for the welfare of the patient who is the subject of it. Were such experiments conducted not for the welfare of the patient, but simply for the advancement of knowledge, there would be justification for the attitude of some of whom I have spoken. But I venture confidently to assert that they are not so conducted. Much as the physician or surgeon may desire, and rightly desire, to profit by the knowledge gained through his 'experiment,' his action is in every case directed not to the desired intellectual gain, but wholly to the welfare of the patient. But while he is thus bent on healing the particular sick man who is the subject of the 'experiment,' it is not only permissible for him to make use of the knowledge afforded by the 'experiment,' it is his duty to do so, for this reason alone, if for none other, that the newly gained knowledge makes for the welfare of succeeding patients. The whole progress of the art of medicine lies in the knowledge gained by one 'experiment' lessening the factor of uncertainty in succeeding 'experiments,' and so making the art less and less experimental, more and more sure and effective. The increment of knowledge gained by each 'experiment' may be written out as a decrement of human suffering and pain.

The complaint which I am now venturing to make is that the teachings of the multitude of 'experiments' made daily in our hospitals are not adequately laid hold of. Chiefly, and foremost, would I insist on one great shortcoming—namely, that the analysis of the phenomena presented at the bedside and in the *post-mortem*

room is not so exact, so complete, and especially not so systematic as it might be and as it ought to be. I am fully aware of the great progress which has been made since the days when I was a student. It was while I was a student that the clinical thermometer, that type of exact physical analysis, came into use; before that time every one had to be content with an inexact and delusive test of temperature—the feeling of the hot skin. I am fully aware of what other progress has been made in the physical, in the chemical, in the bacteriological, or, as I would rather say, in the biological analysis of disease. But I nevertheless venture to assert that all such analysis, extended and improved though it be, still falls far short of what it should be. If we are to master the secrets of diseases, we cannot too much strive to learn; we cannot make the analysis of each experiment too exact or too complete.

Here in passing let me, with the view of disarming popular criticism, point out that the full and complete analysis of which I am speaking must, like the rest of the 'experiment' of which it is a part, be so conducted that the object of the experiment, the welfare of the patient, is kept clearly in sight. But by the welfare of the patient I mean the real welfare intelligently grasped, not what ignorance may mistakenly conceive as welfare. I well remember how, when in the dark places of a country practice I began to use the clinical thermometer, I was reproached with needlessly 'worrying' the patient by bystanders who did not understand the value of exact knowledge. And in other dark places exact analysis will always be looked upon as needless 'worrying' by the ignorant onlooker. But the wise and good healer will always be alert to mark the line carried beyond which attempts at analysis cease to make for the welfare of the patient, knowing that the exact point at which careful examination passes over into harmful disturbance must depend upon the circumstances of each particular case.

I need not here dwell at length on each of the many and varied particulars of the exact analysis of which I am speaking. It will be sufficient for my present purpose if I say that the analysis which I have in mind is one which demands the use of the exact methods and of the instruments of precision employed in physical, chemical, and biological inquiry. The phenomena of disease, being phenomena of living beings, present themselves, in most if not in all cases, as problems, as mixed problems of physics, chemistry, and biology, to be grappled with by the doctor as they are grappled with by the physicist, the chemist, and the biologist. The analysis, to be adequate, must be carried out by means of adequate appliances. The days when a test-tube, a spirit-lamp, and an imperfect microscope supplied all the equipment needed for such an analysis have long passed away. Such an examination as the present state of science makes imperative can no longer be conducted in a corner behind a

screen. It is to-day absolutely necessary that, for the carrying out of the exact and complete analysis of the phenomena of disease, demanded alike in the interests of the individual patient and for the well-being of mankind, each hospital should be provided with laboratories, clinical laboratories, fully equipped with all the needed appliances of science.

And the complaint which I am now making narrows itself down to this, that, in spite of all which has recently been done, our great hospitals in London are still very deficient in such an equipment. I venture to assert that in this respect our London hospitals in general are both absolutely behindhand and relatively in the rear of hospitals not only in other countries but even in our own provinces.

Whether or no it is desirable that every large hospital in London should have attached to it physical, chemical, and physiological laboratories for the instruction of students in the sciences introductory to medicine, is a question about which opinions may justly differ. I myself am strongly of opinion that instruction in these sciences would be more economically and at the same time more efficiently carried out in some one or two common centres. But there can be no such divergence of opinion as to the need of each hospital having as a part of its constitution clinical laboratories of the kind of which I am speaking. Such laboratories, not indirectly only, but in a most direct manner, make for the welfare of the patient, and in this respect may be clearly differentiated from educational laboratories. So essential are they to the due care of the sick that the sums necessary for their equipment and maintenance must be regarded as a charge on the general funds of a hospital no less pressing than the sums needed to purchase surgical appliances and drugs.

I cannot here, and indeed need not, dwell on the value of the exact and complete analysis of the phenomena of disease which the possession of such laboratories would render possible. I must content myself with pointing out the double character of the use of such an analysis. In the first place it is most useful, often unexpectedly useful, as a mere determination of facts. Recent as has been the institution anywhere of these laboratories, and limited as still is the employment of them, it has already happened, not once only or twice but often, that some fact laid bare by such a complete analysis, some chemical body detected by exact research, some organism run to earth by careful bacteriological culture, some fact which ordinary old-fashioned examination would never have laid hold of, has been the means of leading up to a correct view of the nature of the patient's malady, and so of bringing relief or even of saving life.

In the second place, the analysis has a larger, more far-reaching

use. Single facts may be of value, indeed, as I have just said, of great value; but the highest value of the results of analysis lies in their general use, in their being made to throw light on the nature of disease. This higher use cannot be carried out by the mere recording in a mechanical manner the results of each analysis, by accumulating gigantic heaps of data, to be turned over by some subsequent inquirer. Such a method of analysis—a method, I fear, all too common—is a method which may occasionally bring truths to the light, but one wasteful of time and energy. To be truly productive, the record of the results of analysis must not be a dead mechanical one, it must be vitalised by a spirit of inquiry. It is the very essence of a successful research that he who is searching should know what he is looking for. Clinical analysis, like other analysis, reaches its highest value when the facts are gathered in with a definite end in view.

The first method of analysis, the mere accumulation of data, with the expectation that this or that fact arresting attention may prove fruitful, may be carried out in a mechanical manner by an inferior agent, whose work perhaps will be all the better if in him care and accuracy are assisted by the absence of ideas.

The second, the higher method, makes far greater demands—demands which, I venture to insist, cannot be satisfied under the arrangements which at present exist in most at least of our hospitals. At each of our hospitals, the higher use of the analysis rendered possible by clinical laboratories of the kind on which I am dwelling means a whole series of inquiries, some small, some great inquiries, of which it may with confidence be asserted that their successful prosecution would speedily lead to a great advance of medical knowledge and a lessening of the sufferings of mankind. But how can these many inquiries be adequately carried out? The possible inquiries are far too many for the powers of even the whole hospital staff, however able, however energetic. Did every surgeon, every physician, every assistant-surgeon and assistant-physician and the like, down to the lowest grade, do his very best, they could, all told, grapple with no more than a fraction of the problems presented to them day after day. The harvest of truth is plentiful, but the labourers are few. This is what I especially have in mind when I say that much, very much, of the opportunity afforded by our great hospitals for the advance of medical knowledge is running to waste.

Here may I venture, with all the hesitation which ought to mark the suggestions of an outsider—and I, alas! have been for many years an outsider to the profession—to make a suggestion? I hear much nowadays of 'post-graduate study.' I am not sure that I quite know what is meant by these words. Sometimes I hear them so used, as if they meant the means of enabling a graduate to learn in an ordinary way what he ought to have learnt before he was a graduate,

but did not. Such post-graduate study, I venture to think, so far from being encouraged, ought to be rendered impossible. Sometimes, again, the word seems to be used as if a post-graduate school were a sort of finishing school, a means of giving a polish to the student as he comes rough-hewn out of the examination, and so of making him more presentable. If such is the meaning, the matter is one not urgently needing care and thought. I trust it is neither of these. The post-graduate study which alone, to my mind, calls for strenuous support is that study which fits the student for the task of inquiring after new truth, of grappling not with the known, but with the unknown. Such a training ought, it is true, to be begun even in the studies leading to a degree; but the efforts of the teacher in this direction, however able he may be, are always trammelled by the various contingencies attaching to the conferring of a degree. The degree once gained, these contingencies ought no longer to affect the teaching; the studies of the graduate ought to be wholly directed towards fitting him to use the truths which have been gathered in, and with which he previously had been mainly busied, as a means of laying hold of some of the multitude of truths yet hidden from man's ken; they should lead him from the drill-camp into the battle-field, where he will have to struggle with the demands not of examiners but of Nature.

Such post-graduate study needs no special seat, no particular, isolated installation. Not only can it be carried on in company with ordinary teaching, but it can be more efficiently carried on than when left to itself. In every scientific laboratory the duties of the head of the laboratory (and the same may be said of each of his chief assistants) are threefold: to teach the beginner what is known, to carry on his own researches into the unknown, and to train those who are no longer beginners in the way of inquiring after new truth. The last duty, though often the least in respect to the amount of time and labour which it demands, is by no means the least in respect to the effects which it may have on the advancement of knowledge. And the due discharge of each of the three helps that of the other two.

If there be any truth in what I am now urging, each of our great hospitals, with its wards and with the scientific equipment on which I have insisted, is in reality a scientific, a medical laboratory, the output of which consists on the one hand in the healing of the sick, and on the other in the increase of knowledge, the two being indissolubly joined together. Here in London we can assert beyond dispute that the staff of the laboratory is performing admirably two of the three duties of which I just spoke; it is training the beginner, it is pursuing fruitfully its own researches. Is it equally performing the third duty, that of training the graduate to inquire?

During a recent stay in the United States of America and in

Canada I was told, not once only but again and again, that in the experiences of their medical graduates visiting London, while our ordinary medical teaching—the teaching up to graduation—is unsurpassed in excellence, our hospitals, our general hospitals, are of little use to the graduate, and that the special hospitals do not supply him with what he needs. He seeks for some such post-graduate study as that which I have sketched out, but seeks for it in vain.

It was indeed by what I heard over the water that I was led to the thoughts which I have here laid before the reader. And I ask him seriously to consider whether or no I am right in asserting, as I have done, that the opportunities for the advancement of medical knowledge offered by our great hospitals are not fully made use of, and that a development of post-graduate study as a training in medical research would be to the great benefit not only of our visitors but also of our own graduates, and lastly, though not least, of our patients.

M. FOSTER.

THE RÔLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIETY

I. IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE

II. IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

II

WE must now turn to the English compeers of the Frenchwomen of the seventeenth century. Here, till we get to the crucial point of the comparison, we shall find the task of sustaining the interest somewhat difficult. For it cannot be denied that the Frenchwomen of the seventeenth century were more interesting than the ancestors of the Englishwomen of the eighteenth. During the epochs under notice, the eighteenth century in France and the nineteenth in England, the charm as in the seventeenth century remains with France until we get to the end of both centuries, when the likeness between the women of the two centuries became very close. At their best the English of the eighteenth century seem to be too nearly a replica of their French contemporaries to be very arresting; but it is worth considering how a certain view of tradition derived from the latter can be traced to the end of the nineteenth century. There is also the temptation to linger over contemporary letters and memoirs, of which we have a good supply. Horace Walpole, dealing out his criticism and sharpening his wit on Lady Mary W. Montagu's ugly manners and Lady Craven's spitefulness, brings into full light many details of these ladies' lives they little guessed would ever see the light. This rather adds to the pleasure of reading what they carefully prepared for publication, for one does so with a liberal discount. There are moments when Lady Mary fearlessly exposes the follies of foreign Courts. 'One foundation of these everlasting disputes,' she writes, 'turns entirely upon rank, place, and the title of Excellency;' and in other letters she gives a graphic description of the follies and futilities of English society, concerning which she seems to show more insight than her celebrated censor. And the same may be said of Lady Craven, who, however, was by no means on the same level as her rival; but if she failed, as Horace Walpole said she did, to understand Lady Mary's best points, she was her equal in accurate delineation. For instance, in her letters to the

Margrave of Anspach, whom she afterwards married, she speaks of the misrule of the unspeakable Turk, of the discomfort and absurd ceremonials of the small Italian Courts; and the whole of her correspondence is seasoned with a fine insular savour of admiration for British freedom and British comfort, expressed in forcible and epigrammatic terms. Horace Walpole might, with his exaggeration and cosmopolitanism and his surrender through old Madame du Deffand, to French influence, almost have envied Lady Craven. And so it was with others in the same Society—Lady Cowper, Mrs. Montague, and a long way after them Mrs. West and others. They give one the same impression of possessing considerable cultivation and fine manners, but with stilted tediousness. Of the vein of Puritanism which had certainly permeated the middle class and the more retired upper class, as is shown in Rachel Lady Russell's and Lady Herbert's letters, &c., traces, as we have noticed, still remain in English Society. But it takes the light and air out of the subject, and confirms the impression that neither by way of contrast nor of likeness can the women of the eighteenth century in France be compared with those of the same epoch in England.

Before we reach our friends of to-day we must give a glance at their immediate predecessors, their mothers and grandmothers; and the experience of anyone with half a century's experience ought to be useful in helping us to see Society in the first part of this century as it really was. The great Whig Houses had much to say in the training of the smart world of those days. The traditions of perfect manners, lax morality, political shrewdness, excellence of taste, unrivalled skill in holding a *salon*, were handed down from mother to daughter, till the ebb of the tide set in during the fifties; then it is curious to observe the decline of each of these traditions. Who does not remember, if he is old enough, the courtesy without patronage, the gentleness to inferiors, the rigorous but perfectly natural bearing, which never failed, however morality or religion might fare in the days of his grandmothers? When I was a child it appeared to me impossible to believe that there could be any other way of getting old but that with which I was familiar. But, full of point and amusement as were her sayings, merciless as she was to false fine ladyism, swift and cutting as were her caustic, witty snubs to both old and young, yet I feel when I look back that old Lady G—— must have been a milder reproduction of the preceding generation; for the disintegrating forces of the French Revolution were at work in England, and a woman whose husband knew his Voltaire and Rousseau by heart found the Whig edition of liberalism strongly tinged with ideas which could revolutionise in a bloodless way the exclusive aristocratic upper classes; while the middle classes were protected by the Puritan influence from this disturbing agent.

And so it came about that the puzzled, restless phase which came over French society at the end of the eighteenth century began to undermine English society in the sixties and seventies of the nineteenth in a dull respectable way; manners became democratised, *salons* lost their prestige because the entertainer no longer believed in herself. Of a group of *salons* which still held their own fifty years ago, Lady Palmerston's was the most successful and the most powerful politically, because the widest and the most cosmopolitan. Her charm and great distinction were unhampered by any shade of strictness. She had a delightful *naïveté* in the choice of her political agents that would make us smile now. 'I think,' she would say, 'I shall send the Flea to Rotten Row (a certain little Mr. Fleming, who had the art *de se faufiler partout*), to report to me what the feeling of the country is on last night's debate.' Her two daughters, Lady Shaftesbury and the incomparably witty Lady Jocelyn, helped her not a little.

Lady Granville's *salon* was of a different sort—more exclusive, much more affected, and frequented by foreigners. She had the French gift of receiving without effort. Sitting at work with a shaded lamp near her, she would call out with a word from among those passing through to the tea-room a friend with whom she wished to talk, and one always longed to hear what she was saying, for the friend on the sofa looked very happy and much amused; even 'the lodger,' Charles Greville, who lived on the floor above in Bruton Street, thawed in that corner. Of course, there was the immense advantage of the presence of the master of the house, who, with his wonderful instinct for society, rapidly arranged and rearranged groups, so that a bore, if such were admitted by mistake, found himself neutralised by being handed to someone fully capable of dealing with him. Lady Palmerston, Lady Granville, and Lady Holland may be said to be the last charming *mondaines convaincues*, who never doubted what they should do and say to maintain their power. They sometimes indulged in an inner circle of intimate (small) dinners and tails to dinners, but, on the whole, devoted themselves mainly to the interest of 'the party,' and received all—and a very long list it was—with the most perfect manner, which was simply no manner at all. Each guest, young and old, left the house with the conviction that special attention and marked sympathy had been shown to him.

The later attempts to fill this rôle, the *grande dame* holding a *salon*, were not successful. Strawberry Hill had in Frances Lady Waldegrave's reign a reputation of its own. As a country house it was an amusing one to go to, though her receptions were a little too much of a scramble for it to be distinguished in its *façon d'être*. The generous qualities of the hostess and the mixed character of her guests made up a whole which, as a feature of the epoch, has a special value. Yet, as a *salon* held by a *grande dame*, it was beside

the mark. The strings were beginning to get tangled and to respond no longer to the hand that played with them with a political purpose, and it failed, in spite of skilful combinations and strong personal influence. In later attempts the failure was still more marked; to watch the pulling at bell-wires that rang no bells became to the looker-on oppressive and sometimes ludicrous. Before we leave the last of the *salons* for duller company, there is one personality who ought to find a place in a sketch, however slight, of the world in which Lady Palmerston and Lady Granville reigned supreme. Lady William Russell did not attempt to hold a *salon*; she spent much of her time abroad, and, when she came to England, lived in the simplest foreign way, her establishment consisting of few servants beyond her courier and her maid. But, though not attempting the rôle of hostess, she was almost indispensable at the *salons* of her friends, and still more so at the small *recherché* dinners which were the fashion among the *crème de la crème*. She was by far the strongest personality of that time, a powerful woman, powerful to violence. (So said rumour.) To the fascination which strength of character gives its owner she added the charm of being so free from insularity and provincialism that many people were puzzled as to her nationality. Each country claimed her as its own. A Parisian was at once arrested by her wittily expressed appreciation of both ancient and modern *régime*, of both solid and frivolous literature in France. Then she might be heard talking to the German Ambassador on abstruse political questions; she was equally able, in the purest Tuscan, to discuss with an Italian cardinal the latest news from the Vatican. All this without the slightest pose or effort. She brought up her three sons in a way of her own, utterly unlike any English system of education ever heard of. A Catholic herself, she hated the priest, and wished to have only inscribed on her grave: 'The mother of Hastings, Odo, and Arthur.'

We must leave these interesting personalities and pass on to a very dull epoch, glancing on the way at the theological High Church phase kindly interpreted by Miss Sewell and Miss Yonge. An ideal founded on the inculcation of obedience to the Church, instilled in brothers and cousins from Oxford, gave the more intelligent of the young women in the fifties some perception of what culture might imply; but its pursuit was on the whole uninteresting, still more so were the lives of their frivolous sisters, made up as they were mainly of a great deal of silliness, of love of dress that didn't result in good dress, of flirtations with no background of wit, vice sometimes having its turn at the wheel; but even the vice of that period was dull.

We have arrived at the point at which we may consider the question with which we started—what is common to the French-

women of the eighteenth century and the English of the nineteenth—and this misgiving arises. Are not the dissimilarities so marked as to destroy all resemblance? Yet it is the one interesting point in the study, so the doubt must be conquered. An additional difficulty lies in the avoidance of any portrait-painting. Just as the *roman à clef* is generally very poor art, so in an essay, however unpretending, it would be odious to bolster up the interest by dealing with distinct personalities and not with types. Time is pressing, and someone else said the other day, *à propos* of the expression, 'Now the psychological moment has arrived.' You are talking, as they did in the early nineties, and the types change before your very eyes. Why, ten or fifteen years ago we had the academic fad. The higher education of women was the cry. It touched Society vaguely: Lady So-and-so was determined to send her daughters to Girton or Newnham. The ordinary English and even French governesses were made to wince when comparisons were made between the effect of their teaching and the result of a college course. In many a middle or professional home it came as a solution to the dreary problem of how the girls of the family were to earn their bread, besides giving them the unexpected joy of finding their brains to be undoubtedly fit for something. Those who hate academic training in either men or women railed at the *naïf* belief that to follow the exact curriculum which produced such poor results in men would advance the general status of women. Its evident narrowness and want of elasticity could not strike the enthusiastic promoters of the higher education. Enthusiasts are usually found to be without a sense of humour, and the inefficiency and defects of the women's colleges were scarcely apparent even to outsiders, who were, if in sympathy with the movement, too full of admiration for the wonderful energy and zeal, the untiring and self-denying devotion, of the founders to find it in their hearts to criticise. They did not observe the deteriorating effect of the strain of over-work during the growing years of the young girls who were forced into competition with strong men, the majority of whom cared not to beat them. Every faculty was bent to the task of obtaining marks. Commercially it answered to send such well-equipped teachers into the market, and this, in a way, met one of the pressing wants of the day. But later, in the homes of the intelligent classes, this practical solution was before long pronounced to be inadequate, and disappointment was felt by the parents of the very hard, trenchant, cut-and-dried young prig who returned from time to time to the home she had learned to condemn. Now, the colleges have proved that they have to deal with influences more potent even than ignorance. In Society the ineradicable love of dress and the eternal power of physical beauty prevented at any time any great warmth of enthusiasm in the direction of intellectual training. Men disliked it. They had been used to the toy and doll's house theory. Useless to

quote women of past ages; neither men nor women had imagination enough to see that, with all their weaknesses, not to speak of their vices, the women of the Middle Ages were a superior kind of animal to the average Englishwoman of the last decade of the nineteenth century.

The cult of the Virgin Mary in the Middle Ages did far more to raise the status of women than any other cause at work since the age of chivalry, and the efforts towards intellectual discipline in our day are futile in comparison. Still, these efforts indirectly affected later developments of women's energies, and may play a more considerable part in the history of the woman of the twentieth century than we expect at present.

The 'new woman' followed the student, but was gradually demolished by common consent, and the artillery spent in her destruction some ten years ago by such opponents as Mrs. Lynn Linton, of the *Saturday Review*, was rather a waste of force.

The new woman is extinct, and our next stage in this study—i.e. a sketch of 'The Souls'—brings us very near the present day. Two or three pretty and half a dozen intelligent as well as pretty women may be said to have been the nucleus round which gathered the small and very pleasant company about whom at one moment so much nonsense was talked, and upon whom was lavished much adverse and a great deal of unnecessary criticism. This little society made a homely pleasant start. Some five or six girls and their married friends met once a week, to compare notes on the books they read, and to try their hand at writing their impressions. This was the humble beginning of the so-to-speak club which attracted considerable attention at the time, but which, from exaggerated spirit of clique on one side and the love of detraction combined with irritation at exclusiveness on the other, died a natural death. It made intelligence the fashion for the moment, a false step whose traces may be found in Society even at the present day. 'Don't ask So-and-so to join us,' one of the members said of her friend, 'for she will only work for your soul.' Hence the name 'Souls.' The married friends, some brilliant and distinguished, others scarcely so, but all good-natured and kind, contributed by their hospitality and pleasant receptions in some of the most delightful houses in London to widen the sphere of the souls. A few distinguished men, entering into the spirit of the affair, increased their number to some fifty; but naturally a small company of brilliant men and women did not meet frequently to limit themselves to writing essays and discussing ethics, and the mole of human passions began to undermine the citadel. The enemy from outside, mad to get in and share the spoils, found the ground given way beneath their feet. They were not allowed to share the game, but the game had lasted long enough; the players had dispersed

from weariness, and the whole movement remains only a very pleasant recollection to some, and the source of unreasonable provocation to others. From the time of the Souls to the present day, anyone who cared to study the human comedy, as played in English life by Englishwomen in the last decade of the nineteenth century, would find many types ready to hand which would repay him for the effort he must make to compare and sort the material that composed them. This material is sometimes ungrateful stuff to handle, trivial, second rate, and sometimes tiresome, but other subjects spring up in the investigation—interesting puzzles, perplexing contradictions in characters; still, none without the capacity to appreciate an intelligent aptitude for taking their surroundings from the right angle, and the days in which they lived in right proportion, suggesting the reflection that, in some respects, no other period could have given us the same food for thought and comment.

Another kind of material the past might furnish—more frank, more strong, but not so helpful for our present purpose. Let us discriminate and try to group our impressions; yet in grouping there is the danger of drawing a hard-and-fast line between the groups, and we might lose sight of the fact that where these groups touch each other there is a thrill of communication which brings them all *en rapport*. We shall see there is no actual boundary line between one group and another, but that they act and react on each other all the way down the line, as indeed has ever been the case since the days of the *Tatler*, who tells us that she (the belle in second-rate Society) sees Lady Betty idle and coquet it with Lord Dimple. She resolves to imitate that sweet creature, and longs to be '*en famille* with a nobleman.' To point out that this *rapprochement* exists may prove to be an answer to a very obvious criticism which might well be directed against this humble study of manners. 'These young women,' my critic may say, 'may be interesting, admirable, or reprehensible as the case may be, in your eyes and in those of a small knot of friends, but you will not tell me that it matters very much what they say or do. The great pulse of life in England, influenced, as in all other countries, by the lives of women, will not beat slower or faster because this section of society elects to take its stand on a high or a low plane.' But my answer is: 'Certainly I do assert that it signifies enormously what these women say or do.' The first group is, as I have tried to show, consciously or unconsciously imitated by the other. It does not perhaps amount to the frenzy of imitation and competition that drove, in New York last year, some young and beautiful women to suicide because they were unable to reach the standard of expensive living and fashionable dressing which the dozen, vulgarly called leaders of Society, had pronounced to be indispensable; but, if we look more closely at

home, we shall detect a strange likeness to what we may have seen in London running through each grade of Society, and we recognise the trick of manner and dress, the pursuit of some occupation, evidently inspired and not natural, in some obscure country town. This leavening may be due to some, perhaps, very few personalities in each of our supposed groups, the generality of women following the lead of the few capable ones and rushing headlong through the gate with no knowledge or preconception of what the leaders have in mind. And this, I say, does signify very much, though it is difficult to say what the outcome of it all will be.

To return to our groups. Let us look into No. 1, *Group A*. The general description would be: very smart, pretty, very well dressed. *The best*: witty, and, above all, pleasant; intelligence quick as lightning, but insufficient, sometimes showing literary aptitude and taste; with quick apprehension of how to rule; ~~invariable~~ in establishing and maintaining that rule undisputed, a convincing charm that admits of no doubt or rebellion, and brooking no contradiction, is never disputed or opposed. *The worst*: playing at passion without feeling its force, at sentiment without the slightest hint of poetry or the remotest glint of imagination. Neither the best nor the worst ever shows the slightest scruple on any point. To charm away a friend's husband, still better, her lover, is a sport in which both take an open and undisguised delight. The real power they wield is shown in the subjection of the very first-rate men, who never think of resisting them. The paramount merit of this group is that they make no pretence to be either virtuous or vicious. They may be one or the other, probably the latter, but you will never find them boasting of their evil ways, not even of their most objectionable talk. They leave this to *Group B*, who do both with a falsely rakish air, which is much more offensive than are the worst traits of *Group A*. They are not so smart, and are furious if not thought so pretty. They distinctly imitate the others, cross the border into the A camp, and are proud of so doing. Here we find a little touch of tawdriness and snobbism. They have a weakness for rank which, of course, A is absolutely free from, and they carry the tradition of the former in dress, in manners and pursuits, into the county families in whose houses they reproduce what they have imitated, and subjugate baronets by the dozen, to return to rather a second-rate season in London.

Group C.—Literary, often really intellectual. We omit all criticism of their brain work, this being not the place for it, and we note that the best members of this group simply and naturally delight in their vocation, and are more than indulgent to outsiders less gifted than themselves. Perhaps they are too willing to admire the quick facility of the would-be intelligent. The worst in *Group*

C delight in details of life they have had no share in, reminding one of Paul Bourget's ecstasies over a diamond 'cypher,' or a gold paper-cutter. This delight is veiled sometimes by a quick disclaimer of any such intent, a rough diamond tone being adopted, which proves very successful with Group A.

Group D.—The political woman. The best among these wish, by education, to counteract the influence of Group A. Their faults are so well known that their analysis would be tiresome. They are not altogether free from being charmed with A, while reforming some fascinating member of their frivolous group. One might almost put the learned world and the student world into this group. Girton relinquishes somewhat of its academic haughtiness and cultivates athletics and works pathetically at the improvement of looks, having caught indirectly a ray of the unconscious splendour of Group A, which excites privately its emulation.

Group E.—The artist world. Here we are on difficult ground, since this world touches every other section of Society. The best, both men and women, are indulgent to their amateur friends and give a note of distinction to any society they may frequent. Far from snubbing amateurs, they are the first to acknowledge the worth of the passionate appreciation these display when really fine work in painting or music is in question. The detestable amateur does not appear here, especially the species who hopes by a false air of Bohemianism to link himself to easy-going artists whom he deludes by his friendship. So far as character goes and the art of life, the amateurs of the finer sort are often startled by a vein of snobbish subservience in artists whose work ought to have rendered this impossible, but who, from ignorance of the world, are seen to prefer a titled and very ignorant amateur to a refined and intelligent friend, who may have passed many years of his life in silent admiration of the genius whose efforts to conciliate Group A give him a severe shock.

This attempt to explain the action of these groups upon each other may fall short of the truth in many respects; so quickly do we move on in these days, so rapidly do different ideals and different ways and customs start into life and follow each other. What was a true description of society two or three years ago may be an inaccurate picture now. Yet I believe that some members of each of our groups survive in the present day, especially in Group A. Such as those who led society then, in the main lead now; in so far as they do not, it is due to the uneasiness, very like that prevailing at the end of the eighteenth century that is beginning to show itself. The novelty of playing at intellectualism is beginning to lose its charm. Those who are born intellectual or have inherited literary aptitudes remain in a way masters of the situation. There are not many of these, and even they are amused by the desperate reckless-

ness of experiment that seems to be not only a reaction against conventionality, but to result from a mad desire to exhaust every form of amusement, and indeed of vice. The husband-snatching, the lover-snatching—in short, the open profligacy—becomes unattractive because nobody is shocked. Gambling is resorted to, but that is such an exclusive passion that it protects its votaries from destruction by other forms of vice. In some cases the quality of attention required of the gambler is intermittently applied to other aims, and the scholar gambler is in a fair way to become a type. What remains? The Kingdom of Bore. We have seen how the Frenchwomen, *fin du 18^{ième} siècle*, after exhausting every form of excitement, were found calling out for the *néant*; and the parallel is curiously close and suggestive. But history, as we know, does not actually repeat itself, and those Frenchwomen gave up trying to understand the days they lived in. There was a feeling of storm in the air that oppressed them, and whose cause they had neither the mental nor moral equipment to discern. So they sat and waited to see what would come, and the great storm did come and swept them all away before they had had time to understand it. Here such a storm may or may not come; should it come, it would be met more intelligently—who knows, perhaps guided and directed; but what would be the outcome it is idle to try to predict. The older generation sometimes amuse themselves by conjecturing what *régime* will follow the present. The following letter is one of several received from a rather shrewd observer, and since there is nothing personal in its note, it may help us to the impression made by the world of to-day on an outsider who has not in view even so definite an aim as the present inquiry:—

Letter from Lady V—,
September 1899,
Merton Tower, York.

It seems strange that such a simple thing as telling you my impressions of English Society should be so full of difficulty. But so it is, and when I remember how easy it was to me to write you long—and weren't they rather ill-natured?—letters from my various foreign stations, I am surprised at myself now for putting down my pen continually without even being able to begin. It was easy enough from Vienna to describe the astonishment I felt at first at the exclusive arrogance of the few people who were supposed to be important in Society, and how, when the ice was broken, the charm of being within the pale, and privileged not to be hustled and overborne by the strife of competing parvenus, quite stamped out the first impression of cold narrowness. Perhaps it stamped it out too readily, for the repose of exclusiveness, however distinguished, is enervating, and, in the long run, distinctly boring. Then Paris—well, Paris is Paris, and a pleasant, clever Englishwoman—such, for instance, as was Lady Cowley—would have told you how delightful the whole life appears when the plunge into it is made without *parti pris*, with the full intention of taking life joyously as it comes in Paris, full of wit, brilliant *causeries*, light enjoyment of the best and easiest Society; and oh, the delight of never hearing a heavy, stupid, or tiresome word! All this, of course, does not prevent one's making a shrewd observation or two on our dear

neighbours which perhaps would not please them greatly. You see, my dear, that I am not assuming that you wish me to write a deep and learned treatise on, let us say, *Les mœurs de la cour et de la bonne compagnie*, and compare English and foreign manners, for you know very well I couldn't do it, and I am, at all events, too wise to try and fail. But I have fought shy long enough at your simple question, and must cease my excursions into the land of irrelevance and try to face it, though it is much more difficult to answer than you can imagine. To begin at the beginning, as the children say, it is certain that people who live always in England have no idea of the delight which those who live abroad feel when the welcome English sights and sounds first greet you after a long spell of exile. I rather think my old governess was right when she said the world was divided between England and *abroad*. Whatever else disunites Continental nations, they are agreed on one point—their difference from England. After admiring our beautiful English porters, with their civil, clean faces and stalwart shoulders, clad in the sacred green fustian, I proceed on my journey. Perhaps I had better own, in parenthesis, that a misgiving crosses my mind as I remember the excitement and interest which the first sight of the blue French blouses inspired. Never mind; you see I am nothing if not an impressionist. The journey from Dover to Yorkshire was deeply refreshing, and I arrived here in high good-humour. You know Lady B. has a remnant of the old faith in the comfortable, and does not expend all her energies in producing a bad copy of old French *boiserie* and furniture, as I am told now is the fad in certain houses; so I was able to revel in the most patriotic way among the comfortable chairs and tables in my room, and to gaze at the freshness of my homely but pretty chintz, and to wonder if everything else was as unchanged in dear England.

Ten days later. I made up my mind not to send my letter till I had looked round and become a little acclimatised in my own country. Well, my acute fit of Anglomania has a little cooled down. There are many charming young women here, and I find myself observing—mind, I don't say criticising—them from a foreign point of view. Dress perfect, perhaps a little too much *clingant* and rather too much uniformity. By that I mean that if one of their stars-elect wears some trinket or *colifichet*, the rage for it gets out of proportion to its beauty or its fitness. I am not speaking of artistic worth, for of that there is no question, nor, as far as I can see, does that element come in with any distinctness into these amusing lives. Conduct? Well, I cannot speak positively, for I have no means of knowing whether, if the temptation of a *grande passion* came in their way, they would yield. I know I can't shock you, so I say I am afraid not! The little passions roused by competition, jealousy, and gossip take up too much of these young women's time and energy to allow of anything so real crossing their path. I wish I could find something I once read in 'Gyp' to this effect.

Taste? Here I come to what is the real stumbling-block to my making a true appreciation of these new acquaintances, for my taste does not run in the same groove as theirs. If I am in France, I know where I am with regard to the *demi-monde*. It is in my hands whether I make friends or not. Some of its members I may prefer greatly to my conventionally respectable friends, but I don't like the latter to imitate the former. I think what annoys me here, if I search for it, is that there is a kind of spurious French ring in some of their ways which I long to point out may be better or worse, but is not the real article. There remains a more severe indictment, and then I have done. Why is one sometimes reminded of what one supposes to be the ways of the servants' hall? Then, as to quite the young ones, girls from eighteen to twenty-five; I feel anything—but reassured about their future. '*Elles sont très inquiétantes, ces petites filles!*' But the spirit of prophecy is not on me, and I am sure that in matters great and small there is nothing more inept and futile than to indulge in that pursuit. We were talking of 'Gyp' just now; how I wish she had not played the fool in the miserable

... and was not afflicted with acute Anglophobia, so that she and I could get off and make a few studies of the country house-parties and London society. No, this letter is too long, as I am convinced I shall be compelled to write to you again very soon.

P.S.—I have actually found in my commonplace book the passage in one of 'Gyp's' novels I was thinking of when I quoted her:

'Où, j'excuse tous les méfaits qui ont pour cause l'amour, qu'il soit l'amour maternel, ou l'amour filial, ou l'amour des bêtes, ou l'amour tout court. Pourvu qu'on ait une âme, ou un cœur ou des sens je pardonne; *ce que je ne pardonne pas c'est de n'avoir rien de tout ça et de faire semblant de l'avoir.*'

My friend will not prophesy, and she is right, for, if we did, our jeremiads would possibly miss the mark in every possible way. Several thousand years ago the form of confession prescribed by the Egyptian priests was a negative pronouncement. I have not stolen, murdered, &c., and so on, leaving the Deity to infer what sins have been committed. We might take the hint and find that a negative position has more chance of holding its own than a positive assertion, and the humble but definite aim of searching for facts, not theories, may prove a successful mode of arriving at something like a conclusion. I believe that the woman of the twentieth century will *not* in any way resemble the platforming, noisy, aggressive ladies of the advanced school, who may themselves be traced to the terrible new woman who afflicted us for a short time; but I also believe that the extinct woman—like Ibsen's master-builder's wife, Mrs. Solness—who threatened at one time to be rehabilitated by the force of reaction, has no chance at all of reincarnation. Nor do I think the *courtisane de haut étage* doubled with the philanthropist is a type that will commend itself to English opinion, for the men held in bondage by her are seldom those on the first line. Nor will the scholar and purely literary woman, or the *grande dame* who dabbles in literature, science, and art, and leads a charming life of eclecticism, æstheticism, and many other isms, prevail, for none of these are adequate; they are not the size, as an American would say. Our successors will insist on something built on a larger and wider conception of life, a type higher and nobler, and therefore more fascinating; for, after all, there seems to be lacking in the very distinct types I have tried to sketch that great quality of charm which is all too absent from the ordinary Englishwoman.

Charm! who can define it? It is an essence, a mystery; it rules in spite of vice and wickedness, not by reason of them. From Helen of Troy to Mary Stuart, the women who charmed look out through the mist of centuries with their 'basilisk eyes,' and arrest even now those who would, if they could, resist their fascination. Who that has seen Sarah Bernhardt as Cleopatra slowly stepping from the barge towards Antony, with the simple words in the golden voice, 'Je suis la Reine d'Égypte!' who that has felt with Swinburne that Mary Stuart's cold cruelty prevailed not with Chastelard, for with

her Ronsard in hand he met death with joy so that he might see that beautiful wicked face once more ; who that has felt the power of these and other instances (why should we multiply them ?) will deny that there is here an inscrutable secret ? Baffled we *must* ever be if we try to explain the mystery. We feel it though we cannot analyse it. But we should beware of one pitfall. In this, as in all mysteries, we have an instance of a duality which cannot be overlooked. It is easy enough to consider only one side of the question. Take the physical side alone : it does not require the lore of a Brantôme or a Boccaccio to point out that, if we do not acknowledge the power of beauty over the senses, we shall go terribly astray. But is this all ? Surely the other aspect of the mystery inevitably must be met. The wit, the intellectual fire, the quickness of apprehension, what would sensual beauty be without these ? Take them together, and you feel what magnetic charm may be, though you cannot explain it. The number of those who possess the secret is not so great in the present day that we need fear the subjugation of the entire race of man in the twentieth century. The exceptions to the commonplace must always be few. Rare instances may exist now. Let us be thankful for them, as we are for genius, and turn our attention to the future Englishwoman. The future Englishwoman ! There are many burning questions she will help to disentangle, but we cannot touch upon them here. Probably the improvement in her economic conditions may, as the Americans foresee, effect wonders. But I shall be told that I have for my ideal something made up of Vittoria Colonna, Diane de Poitiers, and Miss Nightingale. No, my aim is much more humble. I dream of a possible woman having something of the frank, fearless grace, the self-reliant daring, the open-air freedom of the Englishwoman of the past. Give her also charm and sympathy and capability of deep passion, and we may find . . . but, if I do not take care I shall begin to predict, and I have promised not to do so.

MARY E. PONSONBY.

‘THE SOURCES OF ISLAM’

A REPLY

DURING my recent travels in European Turkey, Asia Minor, and Egypt I noticed that the chief topic of conversation among the Moslems was the ‘Missionary Work,’ its consequences in China and the future trouble that it may bring in Moslem countries. Lord Salisbury, in his speech before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, in June last, gave a solemn warning to the Christian enthusiasts assembled at Exeter Hall in the following words: ‘I have explained to you how difficult it is to persuade other nations that the missionary is not an instrument of secular government. It is infinitely more difficult in the case of the Mohammedan. He cannot believe that those who are preaching the Gospel against the religion of Mohammed are not incited thereto, and protected therein, and governed in other actions, by the secular government of England, with which they are contesting . . . But, still, careless action on the part of the British missionaries in a Mohammedan country may, without any moral fault on their part, light a flame which it may be hard for them to suppress. But, dealing with the events of the moment, I think that your chances of conversion, as proved by our experience, are infinitely small, compared to the danger of creating great perils, and of producing serious convulsions, and maybe of causing bloodshed, which will be a serious and permanent obstacle to that Christian religion which we desire above all things to preach. I urge them to abstain from all appearance of any attempted violence in their religion; to abstain, if possible, from undue publicity wherever misconstruction is likely to be placed upon their action.’

His Highness the Khedive of Egypt, one of the most enlightened and liberal-minded princes of Islam, informed Sir John Scott, on the eve of his departure from this country, that His Highness was not aware of any more serious cause of friction between England and Egypt than the religious or missionary question. Notwithstanding such serious warnings, Sir William Muir, who has had some administrative experience, has thought fit, at such a critical time, once more to attack the fountain-head of Islam. He professes to have

made a remarkable discovery in a new book which, he declares, is destined to shatter into atoms the foundation of the religion of Mohammed. The grateful thanks of the Christian world, he adds, are due to the author of the remarkable production which he had the honour to notice in the last number of this Review. He also recommends translation into all Eastern languages, an English version as well as an *édition de luxe*, of *The Sources of Islam* to rescue the work from oblivion. As a matter of fact the book which he reviews as a recent publication has been already in existence for five years, and the wide publicity which he desires for this work has already been given to it by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge in all parts of the world. I am surprised that Sir William, who takes such keen interest in missionary work, and especially in missionary books on Islam, failed to notice this work before. The Rev. W. St. Clair-Tisdall (by-the-bye Sir William has misspelt the name), the author of *The Sources of Islam* and the secretary of the C.M.S. Mission, Julfa, Isfahan, Persia, delivered in 1891-2 a course of lectures on Mohammedanism by the desire of the trustees of the James Long lectureship fund. These lectures were in 1895 published under the direction of the Tract Committee of the S.P.C.K. in book form. The book was divided into four chapters, viz. : I. 'The Strength of Islam,' II. 'The Weakness of Islam,' III. 'The Origin of Islam,' and IV. 'The Influence of Islam : Islam and Christianity'—and was named *The Religion of the Crescent*. It is the third chapter of the book, viz. 'The Origin of Islam,' which is now reprinted under the name of *The Sources of Islam*, with a few additions. Sir William says :

It takes up a subject never yet brought properly under discussion, either by Mohammedans or Christians, viz. the origin of the Coran and the sources from which both it and tradition have been derived. . . . Now, if it can be shown that much of this grand book can be traced to human and unworthy sources existing round about the Prophet, then Islam falls to the ground. And this is what the author proves with marvellous power and erudition.

As I have mentioned above, this book has already existed for five years, and Islam has not fallen yet. Sir William modestly omits to mention that he himself wrote for the S.P.C.K. a book called *The Coran, its Composition and its Teaching*, which was published in 1887 under the direction of the Tract Committee. When it first appeared it was also believed that Islam would fall to the ground. Nay, in 1855, when Sir William wrote his monumental work, *The Life of Mohammed*, at the desire of a missionary gentleman (according to his own admission), Christian enthusiasts prophesied the speedy end of Islam ; but all of them proved to be false prophets.

Far from being a new subject, the 'origin of the Coran' is as old a subject as the Coran itself. The important points which the

author of *The Sources of Islam* discusses in the book have often and often been discussed by critics profounder in knowledge and higher in authority than either the Rev. Mr. Tisdall or Sir William Muir himself.

What are the principal points discussed? (1) That the Coran was partly derived from the traditions of the ancient Arabs; (2) that it has borrowed something from Judaism; (3) that it is indebted to the Gospels; (4) that it is influenced by Zoroastrianism; (5) that a few men called Hanifs existed at the time of the Prophet who desired the reform brought about by Mohammed, and who also preached the doctrines which he inculcated. I venture to state that every one of the above points had been raised at the time of the Prophet, and the Coran itself repeatedly answers them. There is not a single Christian writer of any distinction who has not dwelt upon these points. Over and over again Mohammed challenged his antagonists to be confronted with the man from whom he borrowed a single line of the Coran, and he invariably challenged them to produce a single line rivalling the Coran in eloquence and effect. There is no proof that Mohammed borrowed his ideas directly from any man or any book, excepting so far as some of the ideas that he preached were also to be found in some other religions. But Mohammed himself repeatedly asserts that he brings no new religion; that what he preached was also preached by Abraham, Moses, and many other prophets before him. The charge, therefore, that some of his sayings tally with the description in the Revealed Books is altogether out of question. The other charge, that some of his statements do not agree with the description in the so-called Scriptures, is also answered by himself. He said that the Scriptures had been forged and interpolated, and that the Coran was sent to reveal what had been altered or concealed. Neither the Jews nor the Christians can boast of a Revealed Book in the sense that Moslems do of the Coran, viz. that every word as it fell from the lips of the founder of the religion, when inspired, has been reported and preserved in the same. The very term 'apocryphal gospel' suggests forgery, and 'revised editions' suggest alterations. Of the Hebrew text of the Scriptures the English revisers say in their preface of 1884 that 'The earliest MS. of which the age is certainly known bears date A.D. 916.' Dr. Wickes, of Oxford, in his *Treatise on the Accentuation of the twenty-one so-called Prose Books of the Old Testament*, remarks: 'How many other epigraphs of Jewish text would, when carefully tested, have to be rejected, notably that of the Cambridge Codex 12, which makes a Spanish MS. unquestionably younger than the one we have been considering, written in the year 1856.' He adds that the Codex in the Inferior Library of St. Petersburg dated 1009 is also much younger than that date. Recent investigations prove that the manuscripts of the New Testament supposed to

be of the third and fourth centuries of the Christian era are merely the productions of the Middle Ages, while alterations in both the Old and the New Testament are admitted by experts themselves. As for the Coran, Sir William Muir himself admits that 'there is probably in the world no other work which has remained twelve centuries with so pure a text.' This brings into prominence the verse of the Coran, 'We have surely sent down the Coran, and we certainly will preserve the same from corruption'; and the remarks of Carlyle that

A greater number of God's creatures believe in Mohammed's word at this hour than in any word whatever. Our current hypotheses about Mohammed, that he was a scheming impostor, a falsehood incarnate, that his religion is a mere mass of quackery and fatuity begin really now to be untenable to anyone. The lies which well-meaning zeal has heaped round this man are disgraceful to ourselves only.

Indeed, the opinion is gaining ground that so far from the Coran borrowing anything from the monkish Gospels and the Rabbinical literature of Spain, which do not possess even the merit of authenticity to enlist Moslem reverence, it is the latter that have borrowed from the Coran and the Moslem chronicles. In a remarkable book called *The Rise of Christendom* the author, Professor Edwin Johnson (late Professor of Classical Languages, New College, South Hampstead), discusses with great ability, impartiality, and unrivalled acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, the opposite side of the question, viz. how much the Jewish and Christian Scriptures owe to Islam. In his introduction, which was published only a few years ago, the author says :

The business of my life for more than thirty years has been mainly with classical and theological literature; the serious problem to which I have devoted all my leisure has been the ascertainment of the origin of Christianity, and the way in which it was first planted in the world. . . . In further researches I found that the whole of the earliest Church literature proceeded from the cloisters of the two primitive orders of St. Basil and St. Benedict. I studied the Coran and the great Arabian chronicle of Al Tabari. I found that the Scriptures of the Muslim had been perverted by the Benedictines with a view to make the Orientals heretics from the Church, and that the misrepresentation had never since been corrected. The great tradition of the Mosque *owed not a syllable either to the Church or to the Synagogue*. On the contrary, both the Church and the Synagogue were indebted in different ways to the great theological system which was in existence long before its Jewish or Catholic sisters. I examined the traditions of the synagogue, and found that the cause of our illusions in reference to the antiquity of Judaism was similar to the cause of our illusions in respect to the Catholic Church.'

The author gives the cause of all misunderstanding in the following sentences :

The truth has long been concealed from us on this matter owing to the fact that the Benedictines first mis-translated the Coran in the interest of the Church dogma, and the prejudice so created has never since been removed. . . . When we come to the Coran with minds disabused of the Medieval dishonesty we find

that the book is nothing less than the Original Bible, i.e. the source of those legends of Origins which have been retold by the Rabbins in the Bible and the Talmud.

This mistranslation of the Coran is responsible for turning Martin Luther against Mohammed. In 1529, in his 'Army Sermon' against the Turk, Martin Luther, after referring to Mohammed as Daniel's Little Horn, remarks: 'The Little Horn's Eyes mean Mohammed's Al Coran, or the Law wherewith he ruleth. In the which Law there is nought but sheer human reason. For his Law teacheth nothing but that which human understanding may well like.' When he wrote this, he had only heard of the Coran and not read it. In 1540 he read one of the above-mentioned translations, and he wrote an epilogue to Brother Richard's *Confutatio Al Coran*. This is devoted to a special disquisition as to whether Mohammed or the Pope be worse. In the twenty-second chapter of his disquisition he arrives at the final conclusion that, after all, the Pope is worse, and that he, and not Mohammed, is the real 'anti-Christ.'

Coming back to the charge that Mohammed borrowed much from the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, it is now conceded by all the hostile critics that he had never read what they call the Testaments. They maintain that he only heard from the Jews certain things which were given in the Talmud. It is, therefore, important to know whether the Talmud, as a book, was in existence in Arabia—or, for that matter, anywhere else at all at that time. The Coran undoubtedly speaks of the Torah (Old Testament), but never of the Talmud or any other book. Professor Edwin Johnson, referring to the date of the Talmud, says:

The Rabbins who constructed the Talmud alone were in the secret of the date of the composition of the Hebrew Scriptures. Now the traditions which still linger in the synagogues with respect to the origin of the Talmud will hardly bear critical scrutiny. There is evidence in them of that same straining after an imaginary antiquity which is characteristic of all new peoples and departures.

After rejecting the belief that the Mishna was written by Rabbi Juda the Prince, in 141 A.D., he says:

It is, in fact, about the middle of the eleventh century that the Ibrim or the Jehudim or Ben-Israel of the synagogues enter the field of historical observation. Between the years 1-1200 falls the first period of the most important literature [of Judaism].

But, granting that some of the sacred oral traditions had been current among the Jews in Arabia at that time, it must be remembered that the ancient Arabs also shared with them the traditions concerning Abraham and the early Patriarchs, for they claimed as much to be descended from those Patriarchs as the Jews themselves. It does not follow, therefore, that the traditions were borrowed by Mohammed from any of the Jewish sources. Among ancient Arabs there were

Sabeans. Their prophets were Seth and Enoch, and they had a book called the Book of Seth. Five prophets were sent to the Arabians, viz. Hud, Saleh, Abraham, Ishmael, and Shoaib. All these existed before Moses, and all of them preached monotheism. The Arabian prophet inclined neither towards Judaism nor towards Christianity, although he honoured the name of Moses and Jesus as prophets of God. 'Follow ye the religion of Abraham, who was neither a Jew nor a Christian; but he was pious and righteous, and no idolater.' This is the gist of Mohammed's religion. He preached monotheism, which was really his single aim and chief mission in life; secondly, he protested against all mediation, and so denounced the Trinity; thirdly, he protested against any privileged class in religion, and so he denounced Rabbinism.

Former prophets [said he] were sent to their own sect. I was sent to all. I have been sent for one thing only, to make straight the crooked path, to unite the strayed tribes, and to teach that there is no other God but Allah, by whom the eyes of the blind, and the ears of the deaf, and the hearts of those who know nothing will be opened.

Sir William Muir quotes a single verse from the Coran, viz. 'that the meek shall inherit the earth,' and says that this is the only passage quoted by Mohammed from the Scriptures. This verse is to be found in one of the Psalms, as the Coran itself mentions. Christ uses the verse in his Sermon on the Mount without being held guilty of plagiarism; but when Mohammed gives utterance to the same noble idea he is accused of literary piracy. It will not be difficult to trace almost the whole of the Sermon on the Mount to the Hebrew Scriptures or to the Talmud, if not also to some other religion. I have purposely confined myself to broader criticisms, and carefully avoided details, because in an article of this kind it is impossible to discuss such questions without wearying the ordinary reader. For the benefit of those who desire to possess more detailed information regarding this controversy I must mention here that all the serious objections of Sir William Muir against Islam have been answered by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in his *Essays on the Life of Mohammed*; that every book which the ingenuity or sophistry of a Christian writer has as yet produced against the religion of Mohammed, and which has been brought to the notice of Islamic doctors in India or in Egypt, has invariably been answered by them. But those books are either in Hindustani or in some other Mohammedan language. Undoubtedly the result of this renewed activity and hostility on the part of Sir William and other missionaries will be—at least, in India—the establishment of a society to be called the Society for the Promotion of Islamic Knowledge. But in independent Mohammedan countries the aggressive efforts of Sir William and his friends will produce serious political and administrative troubles. Sir William recommends the translation of *The Sources of Islam* into

all Mohammedan languages. The author of *The Sources of Islam* goes one better, for in the concluding portion of his book, called *The Religion of the Crescent*, he says :—

In the days of our fathers once and again did the cry of Peter the Hermit—and others like him—resound throughout Europe, calling on all true Christians to go forth in their might and rescue the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem from the hands of the Infidels. . . .

Nay, our duty now is [says Mr. Tisdall], in God's might, to deliver from the thralldom of sin and Satan those whose bodies were created to be living temples of God's Holy Spirit, and to bring them to drink freely of the fountain of the water of life eternal. God is opening land after land to us, and we are endeavouring to enter in to bring the glad tidings of salvation through Christ to the Confucian of China and the Buddhist of Ceylon, to the Negro and the Hindu, to the Eskimo and the Red Indian. . . . But for the great Mohammedan world—for the land where Job and the earliest Patriarchs, where Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, served God, where Moses talked with God face to face, where the Redeemer of the World gave His life a ransom for many—for Egypt and Arabia, for the Sudan and Morocco, for Palestine and Syria, for Mesopotamia and Afghanistan, for Turkistan and all Central Asia, for Persia, Asia Minor and Turkey—how few are our efforts, how trifling our exertions, how limited the number of Christ's labourers! . . . Then wearing the Cross in our hearts, and not only on our breasts, we shall go forth, conquering and to conquer, and the Crescent shall soon fade before the glory of our returning Lord.

Does England conquer countries to make them Christian? One can see the beginning of the flame of which Lord Salisbury spoke in such publications as the above. If this is not a warning to the Moslem to defend himself, or even to assume the aggressive against the Cross, I do not know what other language is. In conclusion, I shall quote once more from *The Rise of Christendom*, which I earnestly recommend every Mohammedan and every Christian to read :—

Our Mohammedan friends [says Professor Johnson] may desire to learn something of us; but it is we who have to learn from them in respect to the great medieval tradition. They are the masters of it. They are of the Orthodox Church; theirs is the sublime theology and the inflexible logic. We owe it to the common civility of the great Empire to which we belong to endeavour to correct the vulgar fables which have prevailed since the fourteenth century in respect to their religion, and to desist from affronting them with what they must ever regard as a corrupt version of their own sacred legends. We need no more controversy, but mutual intelligence. . . . A fresh and exact rendering of the [Book [the Coran into English] is sorely needed in the interests of literary science.

I also cordially support the proposal for a weekly organ in London in the interests of Islam. The thanks, however, of the Moslem world are due to this Review, for its generous hospitality and impartial treatment of all creeds.

RAFIUDDIN AHMAD.

HOOLIGANISM

THIS term, used by the contemporary press, has been explained to be derived from the blundering of a policeman in describing a gang of juvenile delinquents and their leader (Hooly's gang), and is now apparently accepted as a convenient nickname for rowdiness and ruffianism of youths and young men—something akin to the Californian 'hoodlum' and the Australian 'larrikin.' It is to be feared that the name has given a sort of romantic halo, of the 'penny dreadful' type, to a class which is somewhat sensitive to such unwholesome influence.

But the thing itself is not new, though something like a scare has been produced by paragraphs in popular newspapers, in times when the taste for excitement and the tendency to periodical panics seem to be a result of the keen competition of our 'organs of public opinion.' The result has been numerous leading articles in various papers, with reports of speeches and sermons on the subject, followed as usual by letters from people, some of whom are evidently very imperfectly informed on the subject.

Gangs of young roughs and thieves are no new things in London and other large towns. They constitute a feature of low society well known to the authorities, and they have been successfully dealt with in times gone by as well as in more recent days. In the course of nearly forty years' experience and observation as resident Secretary of the Philanthropic Society's Farm School at Redhill, I remember many such gangs being broken up, such as the 'Pontoons' of the London Docks, and numerous bodies of so called 'Forty Thieves,' &c., and even such unpromising material trained into respectable citizenship.

As a matter of history, the idea that the neglected and therefore dangerous class of juvenile delinquents deserved serious attention was grasped in a practical way for the first time in 1788, when the Philanthropic Society (two years before the death of John Howard the Prison Reformer) was founded by Robert Young. 'In 1806 the Society was incorporated by Act of Parliament, and in the same year the Dalston Refuge was founded. In 1815 the Prison Discipline Society was established and for some years did a great work for boys

who would otherwise have been ruined. In 1817 Warwickshire raised nearly 4,000*l.* for a juvenile asylum at Stretton-on-Dunsmore, which was supported for thirty years, when it failed for want of funds.

Parliament, which had apparently left this important problem to private philanthropy, had not altogether ignored the question. Mr. Pitt brought in a Bill in 1793 (five years after the Philanthropic Society had been founded) to provide a kind of industrial school for poor children, such as had been advised by John Locke more than one hundred years before, but it did not command national support. In 1811 a Parliamentary Inquiry was instituted, which resulted in condemning imprisonment of young children, and another inquiry in 1819 had a similar ending. A Royal Commission followed in 1834, and in 1835 a Committee was appointed by the House of Lords, resulting in another Commission, which reported in 1837 in favour of more summary treatment of children 'for the safety of the kingdom.' The following year witnessed the State experiment of Parkhurst Penitentiary, which, however, was given up fifteen years after as a failure.

Some idea of the state of things may be gathered from the *Edinburgh Review* of October 1851 (which reads like some of the newspaper paragraphs of late). It said: 'The young offender gains ground upon us, the plague of the policeman, the difficulty of the magistrate, a problem to the statesman, and a sorrow to the philanthropist.' In the same year an important conference was held in Birmingham in consequence of which, mainly through the exertions of Mr. Adderley (now Lord Norton), Mr. Monckton Milnes (afterwards Lord Houghton), and others, a Committee of the House of Commons reported strongly in favour of establishing reformatory schools; and at length, in 1854, the first Act in their behalf was passed. The Industrial Schools Act followed in 1857.

There can be no more interesting or reliable fact in the history of the Victorian era than the record of work done for the country by these schools, under Government inspection, but not supported by the State beyond a capitation grant to meet voluntary contributions and payments to some extent by county and borough authorities.

Briefly, in illustration of the results of establishing these schools, it should be stated that for many years the commitments of young offenders had increased at an alarming rate, until in 1856 they reached the maximum of 13,981 commitments of children under seventeen, of whom 1,990 were under twelve years of age. By 1860 juvenile offenders committed to prison had fallen to 8,029. In the thirty years ending March 1887 there were 253,397 juvenile commitments to prison, but they had fallen to 4,924 in the last year of that period, nearly two-thirds less than in the first year, and notwithstanding the increase of population (certainly not less than 45 per

cent.) since these schools were established, the number of juvenile offenders after ten years more (1897) has fallen to 1,688 !

The Royal Commission on Reformatory and Industrial Schools (before whom I had the honour of giving evidence) stated in their Report (1883):

Before these schools came into existence, it is beyond doubt that a large portion of adult criminals of the worst class consisted of those who in their childhood had been neglected or abandoned, or trained to a career of crime. From the cessation of this source of supply a gradual diminution in the number of criminals convicted of the graver or indictable offences might naturally be expected; and this result, due doubtless in part to other co-operating causes, but largely to the agency of these schools, has been obtained with signal speed and to a remarkable extent.

It may be asked, what are the results up to date of the work of these schools? These are furnished year by year in the Blue Book issued by the Government Inspector, as the returns of inquiries into the character and circumstances for three years after the juveniles leave the schools. The last report gives the following interesting and encouraging statistics as to *boys* discharged from English schools:

REFORMATORIES

	No. reported on	In regular employment	In casual employment	Convicted	Unknown
Protestant Schools .	2,774	2,173	104	382	115
Roman Catholic Schools	737	493	19	159	66
Or in approximate percentage :					
Protestant Schools .	—	78	4	14	4
Roman Catholic Schools	—	67	3	21	9

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Protestant Schools .	6,613	5,168	335	345	765
Roman Catholic Schools	1,620	1,211	95	115	199
Or in approximate percentage :					
Protestant Schools .	—	78	5	5	12
Roman Catholic Schools	—	75	6	7	12

Special attention is invited to these figures, not only for their deep intrinsic interest, but also to correct some misapprehensions on the subject which have been evidenced in recent remarks in the columns of the *Daily Chronicle*, and may possibly be entertained in other quarters. It was said by one person 'that Hooligans were the lads discharged from reformatories at from sixteen to seventeen years of age, of whom 1,500 are turned into the streets of London every year without supervision or an outlet for their energy.' Another remarked that 'reformatories are Hooligan manufactories.'

It is difficult to understand how such baseless ideas ever get into circulation ! There are forty-eight reformatories in all Great Britain which discharged last year 1,353 boys and girls, and yet we are told that 1,500 boys return to London alone ! Again, reformatories

admit up to sixteen years of age, and mostly retain boys to nineteen years old ; where can those hundreds from sixteen to seventeen come from ? Then all cases discharged from reformatories are systematically looked after and reported on for four years after leaving, and the figures quoted above show how very few of them return to unsatisfactory habits of idleness and dishonesty which characterise the Hooligan species : while abundant proof is furnished by the Inspector's Report and other reliable evidence of the immense benefit conferred on those who have come under the wholesome discipline and training given in these schools, which has been always good, but has improved and is still improving. From them are discharged those who become excellent soldiers and sailors, thriving colonists, and respectable citizens at home and abroad.

The Hooligan material thus treated is shown to be of excellent quality, if rightly handled ; and to charge the reformatories with the Hooliganism of to-day is like blaming hospitals for not curing cases which they have never received. There is no reason in the world for thinking that Hooligans are ever recruited by reformatory failures, of which, of course, there are a few.

The real cause of the present Hooliganism is, in fact, that magistrates have not sufficiently used the industrial schools for the younger and reformatories for the older juveniles who need to be saved from their surroundings, and we in the work have been expecting this result. If these schools had been more taken advantage of by magistrates and police authorities, this scare would never have appeared, for these Institutions would have prevented or cured most of the mischief. A wave of false sentimentality has passed over the country which has had the deplorable effect of sending back to their miserable environment those young offenders against law and order who should, for their own and their country's sake, have been put under the moral, intellectual, and physical training which these schools furnish in a high degree with most beneficent effects.

If Hooliganism is to be successfully dealt with, not only must the full benefit of the existing law be brought to bear upon the rising generation of such a type, as a matter of prevention, but it is necessary to grapple with those who are older in disorder and crime, and who cannot be brought under reformatory influence without an extension of the age of admission to these schools. It has been urged for several years that power should be given to commit lads to suitable selected schools up to eighteen years of age (instead of sixteen as at present) and to retain them till twenty-one years of age, and this was very strongly recommended by the last Prison Commission after hearing a great deal of expert evidence on the subject.

Let it be noted that only in this way shall we fairly face the most difficult problem of juvenile crime, and the matter is becoming

more and more pressing for solution. We are told on good authority that one-third of all burglars are boys from sixteen to twenty-one, that the proportion of criminals from sixteen to twenty-one is increasing in England and is higher than at any other age, being nearly (sometimes over) a fifth of the total. While one-fourth of all the convictions for larceny are against juveniles under sixteen, 20 per cent. of crimes against morals are committed by those under twenty-one. Why not include these cases in reformatory work? This amendment of the law ought certainly to be hastened by the outcry about Hooliganism, or the next generation will see the situation considerably aggravated in difficulty. Surely the 'sooner the better,' when a remedy can be provided for an admitted evil.

In September 1852 the late Mr. Charles Dickens published in *Household Words* a most interesting and laudatory article on the work of the Farm School, Redhill, descriptive of a visit thereto, under the title of 'Boys to Mend.' He concluded his graphic sketch with the following words :

The system must be devised, the administration must be reared, the preventable young criminals must be prevented, the State must put its Industrial and Farm Schools first, and its prisons last—and to this complexion you must come. You may put the time off a little, and destroy (not irresponsibly) a few odd thousands of immortal souls in the meantime; but the change must come. It were better for you, and the whole constituent body of verbosity, to come to it with a good grace, for the thing is as sure as Death, our honourable friend.

We have learnt by happy experience a good deal since that prophetic appeal, and what is wanted is merely a more general acceptance of the lesson of encouragement we have been taught, and an extension of the area of the great work so well done by these Home Office Schools.

Let it be clearly understood by all concerned (and who is not in some degree in that category?) that for the earliest types of straying children there are Truant Schools, then Industrial Schools for the incipient criminal, and Reformatory Schools for the more advanced stage—these, if augmented by arrangements, as indicated above, for lads up to eighteen, would, if generously used, instead of half-heartedly, as is just now the case, soon prevent and cure most of the lamentable results of bad homes, bad company, and the wretched social conditions which menace the well-being and comfort of the rising generation. It would be strange indeed if misery and crime were not the product of the state of things, both in town and country, which is so generally acknowledged, and the nation cannot ignore it without entailing much that might easily be avoided by taking heed to the lessons of the past, as they appear upon a thoughtful study of the subject.

Much might be said in advocacy of an extension of the homes for

working boys licensed or discharged from the Home Office Schools, which are certified by H.M. Inspector, and the establishment of clubs, gymnasia, &c. follows acceptably; but for the prevention and cure of juvenile crime we must depend on Industrial Schools and Reformatories, and, it is very evident, we may rely thereon with confidence.

JOHN TREVARTHEN
(*Of Farm School, Red Hill*).

A DAY OF PURIFICATION

LET us signalise the advent of the twentieth century of the Christian era by inaugurating an annual dedication of one day to a general and determined effort for a social and material improvement of high consequence to the physical and moral welfare of our people.

Let one day in this, the first year of the new century, and, if posterity see fit, in all its subsequent years, be set apart and devoted wholly to a special campaign against, to a specially vigorous onslaught upon, dirt—to the sweeping away, the washing away, the carrying away, the destruction of dirt—dirt in the widest interpretation of the term: the dirt of persons and dress, and rooms, and passages, and stairs, and buildings of all sorts and kinds, the dirt of yards, and streets, and roads, of every place, in fact, in town or country, inhabited by or used by man or animal.

Let it be a day of dedication to this most useful service, this most desirable object.

Once in the year let there be an united effort to make our houses and their surroundings, to the best of our abilities, as clean as we can make them, and the air which pervades them somewhat purer and fresher; let us have one special day when, throughout the length and breadth of the land, a great and simultaneous effort shall be made by all classes and individuals towards purification and cleanliness.

The suggestion may strike strange at first, but there is nothing startling or unusual in setting apart a special day for a particular purpose.

We have our religious festivals, days in memory of the great facts or events of our religious creed.

We have Bank holidays, four in the year, when people cease from work and abandon themselves to pleasure.

On certain great national occasions, days are, by special order or proclamation, set apart for humiliation, or for thanksgiving, as the case may be.

It is not a strange suggestion, therefore, that one day in each year should be devoted to a particular object.

Nor is the object so strange as at first sight might appear.

Civilised mankind wages, and has in very self-preservation to wage, an unceasing war against dirt.

It would not be specially strange, then, that one day should be set apart for a special effort in that war, to a vigorous attack all along the line, and with all the forces and resources we can command, upon that which soils and spoils our existence, upon that which works such havoc with the comfort, and happiness, and health, and with the lives of great numbers of our people.

It was said by the Royal Commissioners on the Housing of the Working Classes in their Report of 1885—that important Commission in which His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales took so laborious a part and so keen an interest—‘Dirt is an evil almost as conducive to social misery as drink and other self-indulgence.’

What a vista of horrors and abominations, of foulness and unwholesomeness this succinct and powerful description at once presents to the mind’s eye—what a graphic, suggestive picture, ‘An evil almost as conducive to social misery as drink’!

And the absolutely unanimous opinion and verdict of medical scientists—based upon laborious investigations and great discoveries—are, that most of the dangers to the public health arise from dirt; that dirt, when not actually the originating cause, is the hotbed, the forcing house, of disease, the contributing cause to the destruction on a large scale of human life.

The virulence of many of the great visitations of disease which swept across Europe and our own islands has been in great measure due to the filthy condition in which they found the great masses of the population. In later, indeed in quite recent, times serious local outbreaks of disease have also been clearly demonstrated as due to the same cause—to foul and dirty water, to defective or uncleansed drains, or unemptied and leaky cesspools, to the filthy surroundings of dwellings, to the dirty condition of the rooms, or passages, or stairs in those dwellings, and of the people who inhabited them.

And yet, the idea that dirt is a dangerous evil has been slow in permeating the public mind. So many people do not like the trouble of cleanliness, either as regards their houses, clothes, or persons; so many are hard pressed for the time to give to cleaning, or do not wish to or cannot afford the necessary expense of cleanliness. Old people, in particular, whose age is supposed to add wisdom to their dicta, threw all their weight against changes and sanitary improvements. ‘We never minded such things in our day,’ they would say, ‘and here we are. We didn’t die of bad drainage. We got on quite well without your modern fads.’

But gradually the fact that dirt was not only an evil, but also a very active and aggressive enemy, was brought home to people in the most unpleasant but unavoidably convincing way. And with the

demonstration of that fact it became recognised that measures must be adopted to grapple with it.

So vast, however, was the work to be done that only the Government or Legislature was capable of the task. Individual effort was manifestly quite unequal to it.

And so Parliament took the subject up, and for years past has been adding statute to statute for promoting and safeguarding the public health—or, in other words, to combating the fiend of dirt—beginning with the grosser and more extended forms and effects of the evil, and becoming more insistent and minute in its ordinances as time went on. Until what is a great code of sanitary legislation has been enacted, embodying the most comprehensive provisions for coping with the ever-present evil; and a great Government Department has been instituted for supervising and helping the local authorities in the general administration and enforcement of the law.

And armed with the powers conferred upon them by this legislation, local governing bodies of all sorts and kinds have for years past been taking vigorous measures. Municipal Corporations and Town Councils, great and small, have undertaken huge and costly works for the carrying away of the sewage of their cities and towns, and for providing the people with a proper supply of water, and have made provision for the cleaning and cleansing of their streets, and the deportation of the refuse of the households.

And both country and town have been covered with a great staff of sanitary authorities and officials to give effect to, and to enforce, the laws which had been enacted.

This great code of legislation has been of inestimable advantage to the country.

The authorities created by it have done an incalculable amount of good in diminishing the evils they were appointed to war against, and in securing results which it would not have been in the power of any individuals to secure. The large number of Medical Officers of Health and Sanitary Inspectors scattered throughout the land have insisted on work being done and nuisances being abated which, except for them, would not have been done. In some cities not only have houses been condemned as unfit for human habitation, and pulled down, but large areas of dwellings, insanitary from foulness, have been cleared, and better houses built thereon, houses with better sanitary provision and more light and air.

In effect, many of the greater, the graver forms of what are technically described as 'nuisances,' have been abated, and many crying evils have been grappled with.

Indirectly, also, the discussion of sanitation has exercised considerable influence and pressure upon various public bodies and upon owners of houses, both in towns and country; and there is no town where great improvements have not been made, independent of legal compulsion, no counties in which some improvements have not taken

place, new labourers' dwellings of a larger and better sort having been erected by many landlords.

But the enemy, dirt, has not been conquered. The forces to fight him may have been raised and disciplined; the weapons wherewith best to meet him may have been forged, and his dominion may have been somewhat curtailed.

But just as water will ever go to its own level, so does a large portion of humanity tend back to dirt—whether from laziness, indifference, or helplessness is immaterial.

And there have been lethargy and obstruction, and sometimes even opposition, on the part of some of the authorities charged with the sanitary regeneration of their districts; and there have been slackness and remissness on the part of many of them in putting the provisions of the Acts of Parliament into force. In many districts, too, the number of Sanitary Inspectors has been left quite inadequate to the task allotted them, and horrible things continue to go on unknown to them, under their very noses.

The public get glimpses of these things in the reports which appear every now and then in the Press of inquests on the bodies of persons who have died in extreme poverty and isolation, of the appalling state of filth in which the room or rooms inhabited by the deceased have been found—so foul and abominable that even those accustomed to dreadful sights and circumstances have shrunk back overwhelmed by the condition of things.

In the reports of cases at the Police Courts, too, the most horrible details of the condition in which some people live are also occasionally disclosed.

And, as unfortunately so often happens, when a sudden epidemic breaks out in some locality, what a hurrying and a scurrying to and fro there is among the sanitary authorities and their officers; what consultations with medical authorities, what disinfectings, and washings, and scourings, and scavengings, what rush of imperative orders to all householders!—all proving how defective the sanitary condition of things had been when the outbreak occurred, how much there had been left undone, how much there was to do to make things as clean as they ought to be.

That is one sphere of the sanitary or dirt question, the sphere which is within the control of publicly constituted authorities.

And then there is another great sphere which falls entirely within the province of the individual, a vast terrain which comes not within the cognisance or control of the public bodies and public officers, where dirt of various kinds exists and flourishes in various degrees, possibly not dirt in that acutely dangerous form which justifies the interference and penalties of the law to suppress, but nevertheless dirt, with its disgusting accompaniments, its unlovely consequences, and its unfortunate tendencies.

A large library might be formed of what has been written

describing the dirt, the filth in which large masses of people live, move, and have their being, not merely the population of the great cities or of the towns, where overcrowding leads to the most lamentable results, but of villages also, even of the isolated cottage.

There is, in reality, but a small proportion of houses in the kingdom—unless they be quite new ones—which have not their dark and dirty corners. Attics with dust and dirt undisturbed for years, cumbered with useless rubbish, lumber of all and every sort, old papers, old articles of apparel which have passed beyond even fitness for a jumble sale, or the old clothes auctions in poorer London; all the litter the *débris* of household life left there indefinitely because no one had the energy to get rid of it or destroy it, all undergoing a process of decay or gradual transmutation into dirt. Rooms with walls and ceilings stained with dirt or damp, stuffy with the uncleanness of past generations, with forgotten memorials of disease and death. And underground cellars reeking with moisture and tenanted by obnoxious creatures.

Even in some of the best kept of old houses there are many corners which would be the better for clearing out and cleaning.

But these are trifles, mere specks on the face of the country, compared with the condition of large numbers of the houses in the great cities and towns, and even in the villages and farmsteadings.

And it is when we go down lower in the scale of human habitations and classes the greater become the evils of dirt, until we come to the overcrowded dwellings of the poor.

It is here we reach a filth which is a standing menace to the welfare of the community, a filth which degrades those who live in it, which begets, and fosters, and nourishes disease; which slays its annual hecatomb of victims; which saps the vital energies of masses of our people; and which makes harder and more miserable the lives of countless numbers of our working population.

Here we are face to face with what is a national disgrace, and what, if not boldly grappled with, may in process of time become a national danger. The stables of our horses, even the kennels of our dogs, often are cleaner and airier than some of the overcrowded dens in which the people live.

In many cases even the newly-built houses are little of an improvement on the old ones; 'jerry-built' houses, run up simply as more or less swindling financial speculations, and so built in the flimsiest, cheapest way, and constructed of the worst material—'bad bricks, bad drains, bad workmanship, bad everything, rotten from the first.'

Nor is it merely inside the houses and buildings that dirt exists. For outside them, in yard or garden, what heaps of accumulated filth, of rotting rags, of decaying wood, of rusting iron, of broken crockery, what pools of foul and stagnant water!

It is not only in the great cities and towns that such a sad state of affairs exists. In small towns and also in the villages there are

overcrowded slums of the vilest and filthiest description; and on many estates and farms there are cottages which are a disgrace to their owners even more than to their occupiers.

Among the many causes of the dirt which is so common yet so conspicuous, overcrowding has been recognised as one of if not indeed the greatest. The wage-earning classes must be near their work or near those who purchase the product of their labour, and where the pressure of population is great, and house accommodation limited, the most fearful overcrowding has ensued.

The evils flowing from this overcrowding with its resultant dirt and uncleanness are far-reaching and of grave consequence, not alone to the people themselves who are involved in them, but to all classes of society, to the very nation itself.

They have been described so often that they must be familiar to most people who take any interest in public or social affairs, and no minute description of them is here needed. But it is necessary to recall and impress the fact that the people involved in them suffer in every way, physically, morally, and mentally, whilst the nation suffers from so large a proportion of its citizens being in these untoward circumstances.

Summarising then the present condition of things as regards cleanliness and dirt, and the machinery devised by the State for the sanitary regulation and welfare of the people, it is as near as possible to the actual truth to say that, large masses of the people live in an absolute state of filth, with all the discomforts, drawbacks, and dangers attached to it; large masses in more or less dirt, with grimy surroundings. And while there are vast numbers of all classes who work hard to secure and maintain cleanliness, and live in a comparative state of cleanliness, yet there are comparatively few whose surroundings would not be the better for an occasional extra effort at cleaning.

And to cope with the dirt that daily springs into being there is a great number of local authorities of various sorts and kinds, with their organised staffs of officials, all with the most extensive legal powers conferred upon them by the Legislature.

But this machinery which has been set up by the State, and which should be almost if not quite equal to the task set it to do, groans and creaks in its operations: the wheels get clogged; its power is wasted or not fully utilised, and though it does immense good, it fails to deal with the difficult task before it as efficiently or as thoroughly as it might, or as it is intended to do.

The truth is that very many of those who work this vast machinery, conscientious and well meaning though they are, want more energy infused into them; they should be urged and incited to work the engine at a greater rate of speed; they should stoke the fires better, should get up a greater head of steam; they should turn all its powers to account, instead of allowing so many of them to lie dormant or run to waste.

That infusion of energy can only be brought about by the pressure of public opinion ; not the pressure of mere local opinion, which is quite insufficient, but of the far more quickening and powerful force—national opinion.

And no way of putting the pressure of national opinion upon them, and of inspiring them with greater energy, is more likely to succeed than by a special day being fixed upon and set apart by the nation for a general national inquisition—a special day when each and all the local authorities shall simultaneously investigate and consider the state of cleanliness or dirt of the places and dwellings within their jurisdiction, and the efficiency of the machinery at their disposal for combating the evils of which they become cognisant.

A day such as that would bring them vividly face to face with a duty which, from very familiarity, sinks into mere routine, and so loses much of its real efficiency ; a larger conception of their work and of its importance would be given them ; once in a year they would be compelled to abandon the so painfully common^d hand^d to-mouth way of dealing with affairs or of letting them drift ; they would be called upon to review their year's sanitary work, to compare the existing with the previous state of things, to consider whether there had been progress or retrogression, to ascertain what defects or deficiencies had been brought to light, and to take counsel together as to the improvements which experience suggested.

Many a torpid local authority would thus be stirred to a more vigorous application and enforcement of the measures which have been devised by the wisdom of Parliament for the sanitary welfare of the people. Even those which are energetic might be incited to measures of more far-reaching benefit to the public with whose interests they are charged.

That would be one great effect of such a day.

But, independent of the sphere of work of these publicly constituted authorities, there is the great sphere which pertains to the individual—a sphere which lies outside their cognisance or control, and which in even greater degree requires quickening and vivification.

Fortunately with very many people of all classes cleanliness is a passion regarded with wholesome pride—even among the poorest cottagers or tenants one sometimes finds everything almost spotlessly clean. To them a just tribute of praise can be paid, both for what they accomplish and for the bright example they set.

But what far greater numbers are there of persons who, from one reason or another, are content with a low standard of cleanliness, of persons who go through their lives doing as little in the way of cleaning as they can, who drift or scramble along from one year's end to the other in a more or less dirty sort of way, some from poverty, some from want of strength or want of time, many from laziness or indifference, some from very degradation and debasement of character !

To those who flagrantly ignore or defy the law as it at present exists, and who are found out, compulsion can be applied.

Apart from them, however, beginning with the people who live in a state of dirt just within the legal limit, just not bad enough to make them liable to the penalties of the sanitary laws, yet still very bad, up through all the gradations of uncleanness to cleanliness, no compulsion can be applied. These can only be persuaded or incited to aim at, to strive for higher levels of cleanliness.

In this great sphere of individual action and inaction, the public setting apart of a day in each year to the special purpose of cleanliness would, it may most confidently be asserted, have the most wide-reaching and beneficial effects.

That a day should be set apart by the nation for such a purpose would be so novel and remarkable a fact that it must of necessity strike the imagination, and impress all with the importance of the cause to which the day is to be devoted.

• That the day should be for the performance of a national and not merely a personal duty would make people realise the general community of interest in the furtherance of cleanliness and in the destruction of dirt, and would make them feel that they were not isolated units whose conduct of life was of no concern to their neighbours or to the rest of the nation.

Some it would stir from their slough of despond, and shame for their inaction. Others it would induce to break the dull routine of daily drudgery, and would inspire to exceptional effort.

The preliminary proceedings, moreover, the general preparations for such a day, the advocacy of such a day from Press and Pulpit, would be a great propaganda of sanitation and cleanliness.

And the day itself would bring home to many persons a new ideal of cleanliness, of its importance, of its advantages, of the pleasure and enjoyment, even the pride of it.

Some there are to whom, for the first time, it would bring the idea that such a thing as cleanliness was an object desired by the nation—was, in the interest of all classes, a thing to be striven for.

Thus by degrees a higher standard of cleanliness would be spread abroad, a wider striving for it would ensue, and a higher degree of cleanliness would be attained.

And with that improved standard would come, to many at least, a greater determination to emerge from surroundings which degrade them to the level of the condition of common beasts, and from those circumstances which sap their health and strength and that of their children, and which darken and dim the few rays of a brighter life which penetrate to their hard circumstances.

And what should be a most powerful additional incentive to the adoption of such a day is the fact that the disadvantages, and dangers, and demoralisation of dirty surroundings are not limited in their

effects to the present generation. Succeeding generations are also deeply concerned, for anything that retards or dwarfs the healthy physical and moral development of the present and rising generation must infallibly tell upon the stamina of the nation in years to come.

This is a matter of vital consequence, more vital now than ever, having regard to the greater competition which it is evident our nation and people must face in coming time.

I have thus, little more than briefly, sketched the arguments for, and the beneficial results which I conceive would follow, the national adoption of a 'Day of Purification.'

It would be ridiculous to assert that the institution of such a day would be an instantaneous panacea for all existent evils.

They are far too wide-spread, too deep-seated, too habitual, for any instantaneous cure.

It might, however, be the beginning of the first step in a movement, the starting of a force which would tend to mitigate them by raising the moral standard of a considerable portion of the population; and as time went on, material and lasting improvements might—indeed, one may say would—result from it.

And it may be too much to hope that so novel a suggestion would be all at once universally adopted, that such an institution could spring into existence at one bound.

But 'well begun is half done,' and if a really good start were made in this first year of the new century, the movement, as years went on, might gain ever wider recognition and more cordial co-operation, until at last a day devoted to this work might become an institution as definite and universal as our Bank holidays, or as one of our great religious commemorations.

And just a few words as to that start, and as to the best means of giving effect to this suggestion.

Essentially, the first motive impelling power must come from Parliament, not in the form of an Act, which would be unnecessary, and which would take time, but in the shape of a Resolution expressing approval of such a step, or still better in the shape of an Address to the Crown.

With that authority, the cordial co-operation of the Local Government Board and of the various local governments and authorities throughout the kingdom, from the London County Council downwards, could be relied upon, and their vast machinery employed to make the movement a reality and a success.

And as regards the sphere of individual action, though some energy and labour may be required, there should not, in these times, be much difficulty in inducing all to heartily join in a vigorous national effort for the furtherance of such a cause.

The cause of cleanliness, indeed, possesses the virtue of being a subject upon which all classes and sects can cordially unite.

It might be advocated by the Press of all political parties without sacrifice of political principle—the Press which is ever ready to further any objects of public welfare.

It might be preached from all pulpits; for here there is nothing sectarian, and ‘cleanliness is next to godliness.’

It could be advocated in all schools, for the practice of cleanliness and the inculcation of the idea are subjects upon which all educational theorists could unite, and which children cannot too early in life begin to learn.

And if the idea received the seal of Royal approval and aid, the prospect of success would be assured.

Eminently too is this a task in which our ladies and womenfolk might take a most effective part. They have done and are doing splendid work in many a public cause, and here is one into which they could throw themselves heart and soul, and in which they could make their influence most powerfully felt.

No further indications of means to secure the end need be dwelt on. Our people, accustomed as they happily are to self-government and to adopting the organisations best suited to attain the end in view, would know best how to work out a cause which commends itself to them.

With such advocacy and approval, and, when the day came, with such co-operation, a movement would be originated which, in all reasonable probability, would have both immediate and far-reaching results of great and permanent benefit to the people of this kingdom.

And lastly, a word as to the best day in the year for the national ‘Day of Purification.’

For obvious reasons it would be desirable to select a time when the days are long and the weather warm.

A day in spring would be preferable, many people’s minds being already attuned to the idea of a spring cleaning.

And it would probably be better to select a definite date than a movable one. We all remember Christmas Day better than any movable festival of the Church. It would be well, too, to keep the day clear of the Whitsuntide holidays.

Whitsunday cannot be earlier than the 10th of May; Easter cannot be later than the 25th of April.

The 1st of May would be clear of either Easter or Whitsuntide celebrations or holidays, and would probably be as good a day as could be fixed upon.

I attempt no peroration, beyond most earnestly commending this suggestion of a national and annual ‘Day of Purification’ to the calm and sympathetic consideration of all who have at heart the present and future welfare of our people and nation.

. HENRY JERMON.

THE NICARAGUA CANAL QUESTION AND THE CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY

THE complications that have lately arisen in the United States policy with regard to the control of the proposed interoceanic canal across the American isthmus are almost entirely due to the introduction of a Bill into the House of Representatives on the 7th of December, 1899, commonly known as the 'Hepburn' Bill, providing for the construction of an interoceanic canal through Nicaraguan territory under the absolute and exclusive control of the United States.

The 'complications' may be briefly stated as follows. On the introduction of the above-mentioned Bill into Congress, the Executive became alarmed lest, if the Bill should pass both Houses, its provisions would involve the United States in a serious dispute with Great Britain. The Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, was accordingly directed to open negotiations with Her Majesty's Government, with a view to obtaining their consent to the modification of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty of 1850 by means of a Convention, the purpose of which should be to remove any objection which might arise out of that treaty to the construction of a canal under American control. Her Majesty's Government agreed to make this concession on two conditions: first, that the canal should never be closed against any nation, but should be open to all nations on equal terms; and secondly, that no fortifications should be erected on the canal by the United States. A Convention was accordingly drawn up and signed on the 5th of February, 1900, by Lord Pauncefoot and Mr. Hay containing the requisite modifications, and was referred on the same day by the President to the Senate for its approval. The Senate thus have before them at the present moment a Convention modifying the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and thereby acknowledging its existence, and a Bill which directly disregards and defies it.

Before discussing the Hepburn Bill and the statements brought up by its supporters to prove that the United States is no longer bound by the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, it may be as well to give a

brief account of the opposition to the Hay-Pauncefote Convention.

Besides party and interested opposition, the Convention has been mainly opposed owing to the clause in Article 2 prohibiting the erection of 'fortifications commanding the canal or the waters adjacent.' To this article the Senate have recently accepted an amendment proposed by Mr. Davis, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, which runs as follows :

'It is agreed, however, that none of the immediately foregoing conditions and stipulations shall apply to the measures which the United States may find it necessary to take for securing by its own forces the defence of the United States and the maintenance of public order.'

This amendment, although more or less innocent-looking at first sight, if it is agreed to by Great Britain, is broad enough to give to the United States Government the right to erect any fortifications they wish, and to consider the canal as one of the lines of national defence, which it was the purpose of the Convention to prohibit. The amendment was based by Mr. Davis on the 10th Article of the Treaty of Constantinople, signed on the 29th of October, 1888, whereby the European Powers agreed that nothing in the treaty neutralising the Suez Canal 'should interfere with the measures which His Majesty the Sultan might find it necessary to take for securing by his own forces the defence of Egypt and the maintenance of public order,' and further that 'it is likewise understood that the provision of the four articles aforesaid shall in no case occasion any obstacle to the measures which the Imperial Ottoman Government may think it necessary to take in order to insure by its own forces the defence of its other possessions situated on the eastern coast of the Red Sea.'

It is not easy to see what analogy there is between the two cases: the territory through which the Suez Canal was constructed was a tributary province of Turkey, and so, as was only just, she was given the right to erect defences sufficient for the maintenance of order and the protection of *her own* territory; whereas the territory on which the United States wish to erect fortifications in no way belongs to the United States, and is at some distance from its frontier. Mr. Davis's argument therefore seems to be rather illogical, that because the right of erecting sufficient fortifications is given to a country through whose territory a canal runs, for the proper defence of that country, therefore the United States ought to be allowed to erect fortifications on a canal running through what in time of war would be a neutral territory, for the defence of the United States.

The question may perhaps be raised, Why should we not give the United States the right they ask for to control the canal, since

they are providing the money to build it? On the other hand, what right have we to grant exclusive privileges to the United States, enjoyed by no other nation, and to the detriment of any nation with whom the United States may be at war? No nation would look with favour on such a clause, which, even if it did not lead to the construction of another canal, would be sure to involve the United States in serious disputes; whereas to a treaty of perfect neutralisation, as proposed in the present Convention, all nations would be likely to agree, since the rights of all would be perfect. Although there is such a strong feeling throughout the country that the United States ought to fortify the canal for the purpose of national defence, yet at the same time it is almost unanimously agreed that the canal must be neutral and open to all nations on equal terms; two ideas which would seem to be quite incongruous.

A further argument against the erection of fortifications, and one which has been brought forward by several prominent men, among others the Admiral of the United States Navy, Admiral Dewey, is that the erection of fortifications for the protection of the canal would be only to invite hostilities to its locality.

Another question which has given rise to a certain amount of discussion is what form the neutralisation of the canal should take with regard to ships of war. Two plans have been proposed: first, to permit the passage of all ships of war of all nations without discrimination, and second, to exclude the battleships of belligerents. The former plan has met with the most general approval as being most likely to insure complete neutrality, and has already been found to work very well in the case of the Suez Canal. The only objection that could be raised against it is that the power of the United States fleet would be doubled thereby; but then the same argument would apply to our own fleet also. The second plan has a very strong objection to it. Any attempt to exclude men of war of belligerents would involve the exercise of such wide discretion, and of so large a measure of arbitrary power, that it would be almost certain to lead to disputes and serious complications between the belligerents and the party exercising that power.

The Hepburn Bill, which has been the chief cause of the present situation, provides for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Section 1 authorises the President of the United States 'to acquire from the States of Costa Rica and Nicaragua for, and in behalf of, the United States, control of such portion of territory now belonging to Costa Rica and Nicaragua as may be desirable and necessary, on which to excavate, construct, and protect a canal of such depth and capacity as will be sufficient for the movements of ships of the greatest tonnage and draft now in use, from a point near Greytown, on the Caribbean Sea, via Lake Nicaragua, to Breto, on the Pacific Ocean;

and such sum as may be necessary to secure such control is hereby appropriated out of the money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.'

Section 2 provides 'that when the President has secured full control over the territory in section 1 referred to, he shall direct the Secretary of War to excavate and construct a canal and waterway from a point on the shore of the Caribbean Sea . . . to a point near Breto, on the Pacific Ocean . . . and the Secretary of War shall also construct such safe and commodious harbours at the termini of the said canal, and such provisions for defence, as may be necessary for the safety and protection of the said canal and harbours.'

In the Clayton-Bulwer treaty Great Britain and the United States declared that 'neither the one nor the other would ever *obtain* or maintain for itself any *exclusive* control over the said ship canal,' and 'that neither would ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same, or in the vicinity thereof, or *occupy*, or *fortify*, or *colonise*, or *assume*, or *exercise any dominion* over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America,' and further that 'neither Great Britain nor the United States *would take advantage* of any intimacy or use any alliance, connection, or *influence* that either may possess with any State or Government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one, any right or advantage in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not, be offered on the said terms to the citizens and subjects of the other.'

The last Article, 8 (which is given in full because it establishes a 'General Principle' which cannot be deemed obsolete and liable to abrogation on that or any other ground), declares that 'The Governments of Great Britain and the United States having *not only* desired, in entering into this Convention, to accomplish a *particular* object, but also to establish a *general* principle, they hereby agree to extend their protection, by treaty stipulations, to *any other* practical communications, whether by canal or railway, across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and especially to the inter-oceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama. In granting, however, their joint protection to any such canals or railways as are by this article specified, it is always understood by Great Britain and the United States that the parties constructing or owning the same *shall impose no other charges* or conditions of traffic thereupon than the aforesaid Governments shall approve of as just and equitable; and that the same canals or railways being open to the citizens and subjects of Great Britain and the United States on *equal* terms, shall also be open on like terms to the citizens and subjects of every other

State which is willing to grant thereto such protection as Great Britain and the United States engage to afford.'

The provisions of the Hepburn Bill are therefore in direct violation of all the above stipulations of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. The supporters of the Bill, however, assert that the treaty is no longer binding 'by reason of the conduct of Great Britain,' and that therefore the United States are at liberty to construct a canal and to control it in whatever way they may think best. Mr. Shackleford, a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in a minority report on the Bill writes:

'The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as is clearly shown by Mr. Hepburn, long ago ceased to have any binding force by reason of the conduct of Great Britain.'

Such a statement, made by two members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one would naturally suppose would be grounded on facts, and have some very strong case behind it. Far from that being the case, I think it will be seen from the following brief review of the history of the treaty that Great Britain has never wilfully violated its terms, while the United States on the contrary deliberately did so in 1880 by establishing two coaling stations on the Central American isthmus.

In 1849 Great Britain held a protectorate over the Mosquito Indians, including the mouth of the San Juan river (the proposed eastern outlet of the Nicaraguan Canal), and also had a settlement on Belize, commonly known as British Honduras, and claimed the Bay Islands as dependencies of that settlement.

A short time previous to this date Mr. Hise, United States Chargé d'Affaires to the Central American Republics, had, without authority from his Government, negotiated a treaty with Nicaragua whereby the United States agreed to recognise the paramount sovereignty of that State from sea to sea. When this act of Mr. Hise became known to the United States Executive it was at once disavowed; but its terms became publicly known, and being in accordance with the popular cry at that time, the President was placed in an awkward dilemma; for if he refused to allow the treaty to be ratified on the ground that it was a direct infringement of the rights of Great Britain, he was afraid of being accused of giving way in the face of British aggression, and yet at the same time he dared not risk an open conflict with Great Britain.

Mr. Clayton, the United States Secretary of State, thinking the best way out of the difficulty was to lay the whole matter before Her Majesty's Government, instructed Mr. Lawrence, the United States Minister in London, to ask Lord Palmerston 'whether the British Government intended to occupy or colonise Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, so-called, or any part of Central America,' and also 'whether the British Government would unite with the United

States in guaranteeing the neutrality of a ship canal, railway, or other communication to be open to the whole world and common to all nations.' Lord Palmerston replied at once that Her Majesty's Government had no intention of *further* colonisation in Central America, and would gladly co-operate with the United States in constructing a canal and maintaining its neutrality.

Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer was accordingly sent out to Washington as special commissioner to treat direct with Mr. Clayton. His negotiations resulted in a treaty which was formally ratified by the two Governments on the 19th of April, 1850.

Before exchanging the final ratifications of the treaty, Sir Henry Bulwer filed the following declaration at the State department :

In proceeding to exchange the ratifications of the Convention . . . the undersigned . . . has received Her Majesty's instructions to declare that Her Majesty does not understand the engagements of the Convention to apply to Her Majesty's settlement at Honduras, or its dependencies.

Her Majesty's ratification is exchanged under the explicit declaration above mentioned.

Mr. Clayton, after consulting Mr. King, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, also filed a declaration at the State Department on the 4th of July, 1850, in which he stated :

. . . The language of the first article of the Convention concluded on the 19th day of April last, between the United States and Great Britain, describing the country not to be occupied &c. by either of the parties was, as you know, twice approved by the Government, and it was neither understood by them nor by either of us (the negotiators) to include the British settlement in Honduras nor the small islands in the neighbourhood of that settlement, which may be known as its dependencies.

The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Honourable W. N. King, informs me that the Senate perfectly understood that the treaty did not include British Honduras.

Believing, therefore, from Mr. Clayton's declaration that the United States Government thoroughly understood and agreed that the treaty in no way affected British Honduras or its dependencies, Her Majesty's Government issued a formal declaration on the 17th of July, 1852, proclaiming the Bay Islands to be a separate Colony with a Governor and Assembly of its own, finding it necessary to do so in order to facilitate the construction of a proposed railway across Honduras. The United States protested, however, against this act on the part of Her Majesty's Government as a violation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and Mr. Buchanan, the United States Minister in London, was directed to inform Lord Clarendon that though the United States believed that 'Great Britain had a qualified right over a tract of country called the Belize, from which she was not ousted by the treaty, because no part of that *tract when restricted to its proper limits* was within the boundary of Central America,' they must insist, according to the express terms of the

Clayton-Bulwer treaty, on her withdrawing from her protectorate over the Mosquito Indians and delivering up the Bay Islands to Honduras, as these islands were *not* excepted in the treaty as dependencies of Belize, and further to demand that the Monroe doctrine should be considered 'an international axiom which ought to regulate the conduct of European States.'

Lord Clarendon replied on the 2nd of May, 1854, that with regard to the Monroe doctrine 'it could only be viewed as the dictum of the distinguished person who delivered it,' and 'that Her Majesty's Government could not admit the doctrine as an international axiom which ought to regulate the conduct of European States.' Lord Clarendon gave the following reasons in support of his statement, that by asking the question whether 'the British Government *intended* to occupy or colonise Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America,' Mr. Clayton fully admitted the right of Her Majesty's Government to do so; and also that when speaking to Mr. Crampton on the subject of an allusion to the Monroe doctrine made by Mr. Squier (United States Minister to Central America) respecting the colonisation of any part of the American continent by a European Power, Mr. Clayton said that the Administration of the United States of that day *in no way adopted that principle*, and that Mr. Squier was not instructed to make any allusion to it in his communication with the Nicaraguan Government.

Lord Clarendon next proceeded to reply at some length to the question of the right of Great Britain to the settlement of British Honduras, and the right of the colony to the boundaries claimed by it at the time of the signing of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and stated in support of his argument that:

Her Majesty's Government certainly understood that the settlement of Belize, as here (in Mr. Clayton's declaration) alluded to, is the settlement of Belize as established in 1850; and it is more warranted in this conclusion from the fact that the United States had in 1847 sent a consul to this settlement, which consul had received his exequatur from the British Government—a circumstance which constitutes a recognition by the United States Government of the settlement of British Honduras under Her Majesty as it then existed.

It may be as well to notice in this connection that Great Britain was afterwards confirmed in the boundaries claimed by her at this time by the Convention concluded with Guatemala in 1859, and that the said boundaries were then approved by the United States.

With regard to the Bay Islands and the protectorate held by Great Britain over the Mosquito Indians, Lord Clarendon declared that the first article of the treaty was only intended to apply to future acquisitions and not to present possessions, and that, therefore, it made no provision against either the Bay Islands or the Mosquito Protectorate, and that, moreover, the Bay Islands had for some time

been a legitimate dependency of Belize, and, as such, were expressly excepted in the treaty.

Two years later (1856), on the initiative of the United States, an attempt was made to settle the disputed points of the treaty. Mr. Dallas, United States Minister in London, was instructed to open negotiations with Lord Clarendon, and to do his best to reconcile the opposite constructions put upon the treaty by the two Governments. These negotiations resulted in a treaty, the terms of which provided for (1) the withdrawal of the British protectorate over the Mosquito Indians, and for an arrangement in their behalf upon principles which should be acceptable to the United States; (2) the regulation of the boundaries of the settlement of British Honduras; and (3) the cession of the Bay Islands to Honduras under certain conditions providing for the welfare of British subjects on the islands, and, among other things, prohibiting the introduction of slavery. The United States Senate in ratifying the treaty amended it by striking out the conditional clause, and substituted one simply providing for the recognition by the two Governments of the sovereign right of Honduras to the Bay Islands. Great Britain naturally refused to ratify the treaty as thus amended.

After the failure of the Clarendon-Dallas treaty, Great Britain offered to submit the controverted points of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty 'to the free arbitration of any European Power which the Government of the United States should prefer to select for that office.' The United States Secretary of State, General Cass, in declining to refer the controverted points to arbitration, said that in the opinion of the United States it was a mere question of the interpretation of the English language, and that they held that a foreign Government was not so competent to decide in such a question as the United States and Great Britain, who possessed that language in common.

Finding that Great Britain would not accept the construction the United States wished to put upon the terms of the treaty, President Buchanan informed Lord Napier, Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, that it was his intention to propose the abrogation of the treaty in his next message to Congress, but that before doing so he wished to know what were the views of Her Majesty's Government on the subject. In the correspondence which ensued Great Britain expressed her willingness to consider the question of abrogating the treaty on two conditions: first, that the proposal should come from the United States, and secondly, that both parties should return to the *status quo ante* 1850. These conditions did not meet with President Buchanan's approval, and he again expressed his determination of recommending the abrogation of the treaty.

The unconditional abrogation of the treaty meant the destruction of the general principle laid down in the eighth article, and, as it was

not the general principle on which the two Governments could not agree, but only the meaning of certain prohibitive clauses in the first article, Her Majesty's Government determined to make one more attempt to preserve the general principle and settle the disputed points in a manner agreeable to the United States.

Lord Napier was accordingly instructed to inform the President that Her Majesty's Government proposed to send a special commissioner to Central America to negotiate treaties with the various Republics, by which the disputed points of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty should be settled, so far as was possible, in accordance with the American interpretation.

On hearing of the President's approval, Her Majesty's Government appointed a special commissioner, Sir William Gore Ouseley, with instructions to draw up conventions with the Central American States settling, so far as might be possible, the controverted points of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in accordance with the American interpretation. Sir William's mission resulted in the ratification of three conventions: the first with Guatemala, signed on the 30th of April, 1859; the second with Honduras, signed on the 28th of November, 1859; and the third with Nicaragua, signed on the 28th of January, 1860.

The Convention with Guatemala definitely settled the boundaries of the settlement of British Honduras, and provided that 'the boundary between the Republic of Guatemala and the British settlements and possessions in the Bay of Honduras, as they existed previous to and on the 1st day of January, 1850, and have continued to exist up to the present time, was and is as follows . . .' Great Britain was thus affirmed in the boundary she had always claimed. The remaining articles of the Convention appointed commissioners 'for the purpose of designating and marking out the boundary,' and laid down rules for their guidance.

By the treaty with Honduras, in order to secure the neutrality of the Bay Islands with reference to any future interoceanic communication, Her Majesty's Government agreed to recognise them as part of Honduras on the condition that the inhabitants should not be disturbed in the enjoyment of their property, and that Honduras should not cede them to any other nation. Great Britain also agreed to abandon her protectorate over the Mosquito Indians residing within the frontier of Honduras, and to recognise their territory 'as under the sovereignty of the Republic of Honduras,' on certain conditions.

In the treaty with Nicaragua, the last and most important of the three, Great Britain stipulated to withdraw from her protectorate over the Mosquito Indians, and agreed to recognise the country occupied by them as under the sovereignty of the Republic of Nicaragua; by Article II. a district was set aside for the Indians with

certain fixed boundaries, and it was also stipulated that the district thus assigned to them should not be ceded to any foreign State, but should remain under the sovereignty of Nicaragua.

There is a very important point to be noticed in each of the last two conventions, namely, that in agreeing to accept the Bay Islands from Great Britain, Honduras thereby acknowledged the former right of Great Britain to those islands; and Nicaragua, by agreeing to the withdrawal of the British protectorate over the Mosquito Indians and the substitution of its sovereignty in the place thereof, formally acknowledged the right of Great Britain's claim to that protectorate, a claim which up to that time she had refused to admit.

In transmitting these treaties to the United States Government for their approval, Her Majesty's Government expressed the hope that they would 'finally set at rest the questions respecting the interpretation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty which had been the subject of so much controversy between this country and the United States.'

'President Buchanan expressed himself as entirely satisfied, and in his annual Message to Congress, the 3rd of December, 1860, announced that 'the discordant constructions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty between the two Governments, which at different periods of the discussion bore a threatening aspect, have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.'

Thus in 1860 the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was restored to its full original authority and was admitted by the United States to be a binding contract, the terms of which were entirely satisfactory to that Government, and moreover by agreeing to this form of settlement the United States clearly admitted the former right of Great Britain to the Bay Islands and Mosquito Protectorate.

During the years 1860 to 1880 the French gained several concessions from the various Central American Governments for the construction of interoceanic communications across the isthmus, the most important of which was made by the Government of Colombia to the famous International Interoceanic Canal Company, commonly called the French Company, of which Ferdinand de Lesseps was the leader, for the construction of the Panama Canal. These concessions caused much alarm in the United States, and resolutions were passed in Congress reaffirming the principles of the Monroe doctrine, and declaring that the United States must exercise such control over any interoceanic canal as their safety and prosperity demanded.

President Hayes in a special Message to Congress, March 8, 1880, announced that 'the policy of this country is a canal under American control. •The United States cannot consent to the surrender of this control to any European Power or to any combination of European Powers.' This was a complete change of policy on the part of the

United States Government, who up to this date had always declared that they had no views of exclusive advantage to themselves.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate in a Report dated April 16 of the same year discussed the treaty at some length, and recommended its abrogation with a view to facilitating this new canal policy. The Report severely condemned Mr. Clayton for having made the treaty, and spoke of it as 'a singular and ill-omened treaty,' and went on to say that 'fortunately, however, for this country the Clayton-Bulwer treaty had scarcely gone into operation before its fundamental provisions were *violated by Great Britain.*' The alleged violation was as follows: in November 1850 an American steamer *Prometheus* was fired upon by Her Majesty's Ship *Express*, owing to her refusal to pay certain port dues and in order, as the Report puts it, 'to enforce a British claim of dominion over that part of Nicaragua.' On the facts of the case becoming known to Her Majesty's Government, Lord Granville at once addressed a note to the United States Minister in London, in which he said, 'Her Majesty's Government have no hesitation in offering an ample apology for what they consider to have been an infraction of treaty engagements,' and added that 'it would be unworthy of the Government of a great nation to hesitate about making due reparation when the acts of their subordinate authorities have been such as not to admit of justification.' Mr. Lawrence in his reply stated that 'he doubted not that the apology offered would be received by the Government of the United States in the same spirit which had dictated it on the part of Her Majesty's Government.' It is hardly fair, therefore, to allude to this incident as a violation of the treaty, since it was the unauthorised action of a subordinate, which, on becoming known, was at once repudiated by Her Majesty's Government.

The Report next refers to the establishment of the Colony of the Bay Islands as the most conspicuous of all infringements. For reasons already given the establishment of a colony on the Bay Islands was not considered by Great Britain in 1856 to be an infringement of the treaty; but, for the sake of argument, admitting that it was, it could hardly be justly brought up against Great Britain in 1880 as such, because, in order to meet the views held by the United States on the question in 1859, Great Britain negotiated a treaty with the Republic of Honduras whereby the islands were ceded to Honduras, and President Buchanan referring to them in his Message to Congress said 'the discordant constructions of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty . . . have resulted in a final settlement entirely satisfactory to this Government.' Surely it is incorrect therefore to say that the treaty was violated by Great Britain in either of these two instances quoted in the Report; but with a strange inconsistency, at the very time the Foreign Affairs Committee were recalling instances to prove that the British Government had on

many occasions violated the treaty, the United States House of Representatives passed a resolution recommending the Secretary of the Navy to 'take such steps as may be necessary to secure adequate coal-ing stations and harbours for the use of the naval forces of the United States at proper points on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Central America and of the American isthmus.' Coal was in fact actually landed under orders from the Navy Department at Boca del Toro, in the Chiriqui Lagoon, and also at Golfito, and the two places were taken formal possession of by the commanders of the Atlantic and Pacific Squadrons in the name of the United States—a direct violation of the stipulation in the first article of the treaty, that neither Great Britain nor the United States would ever 'erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonise, or assume, or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America.'

On the Report being laid before the Senate, Congress passed a joint resolution approving President Hayes's Canal policy, and requesting the President 'to take immediate steps for the formal and final abrogation of the Convention of April 19, 1850.'

Great Britain was not at once directly informed of this change of policy, but a circular note, of a tentative nature, was addressed by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Blaine, to all the European Governments, in which he stated that the United States would regard any joint guarantee by the Powers of Europe of the proposed Panama Canal as 'an uncalled-for intrusion,' and that the United States considered the neutrality of the proposed route was sufficiently guaranteed by the thirty-fifth article of the treaty between the United States of America and the United States of Colombia, ratified on the 10th of June, 1848, in which the United States guaranteed 'positively and efficaciously' the perfect neutrality of the isthmus and any interoceanic communications that might be constructed.

To this circular Lord Granville replied very shortly on the 10th of November, 1881 :

I would wish merely to point out to you that the position of Great Britain and the United States with reference to the canal, irrespective of the magnitude of the commercial relations of the former Power with countries to and from which, if completed, it will form the highway, is determined by the engagements entered into by them respectively in the Convention which was signed at Washington on the 19th of April, 1850, commonly known as the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, and Her Majesty's Government rely with confidence upon the observance of all the engagements of that treaty.

On receipt of Lord Granville's curt reply to his circular, Mr. Blaine wrote a despatch to the United States Minister in London, in which he attempted to prove by quotations from the very voluminous correspondence which took place between 1856 and 1860, that Great

Britain had at different times proposed the modification, the reference to arbitration, and the abrogation of the treaty.

As my space is limited, I shall be unable to deal with Mr. Blaine's arguments in any detail. It will, I think, be sufficient to point out again that Great Britain only proposed to refer the disputed clauses in the treaty to arbitration and not the intention of the contracting parties with regard to the construction of the canal, as contained in the general principle laid down in Article VIII.

In support of his statement that Great Britain had at one time proposed the abrogation of the treaty, Mr. Blaine quoted an extract from a despatch of Lord Napier to Lord Malmesbury. As will be seen, Mr. Blaine only quotes part of the passage, and puts a very different interpretation upon it from which it was intended to bear.

The extract is from Lord Napier's despatch of the 22nd of March, 1858, and reads as follows: 'The Earl of Clarendon authorised me to inform General Cass that Her Majesty's Government would not decline the consideration of a proposal for the abrogation of the treaty by mutual consent.' Mr. Blaine, however, omits the *very* next passage, in which Lord Napier says 'an official character was *not* given to this communication, because the recent overtures of Her Majesty's Government are still under consideration of the President, and because it seems most natural that the proposal for the repeal of the treaty should emanate from that party to which, we are told, it has been onerous and unacceptable'; he also fails to notice that in a later despatch Lord Napier wrote, 'I am not aware that *any* diplomatic overture has *ever* been made here (in Washington) or in London for the dissolution of the compact.'

In spite of the failure of Mr. Blaine's arguments the discussion was reopened by Mr. Frelinghuysen, who succeeded Mr. Blaine as Secretary of State.

Mr. Frelinghuysen contended that the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was voidable at the option of the United States for two distinct reasons:

(1) Because the first seven articles of the treaty related to only a particular canal which was then in contemplation, and that, inasmuch as that canal had never been built, the object for which the treaty was concluded had ceased to exist.

(2) Because 'while by Article I. the two nations expressly stipulated that neither of them would occupy, colonise, or exercise any dominion over any part of Central America, Great Britain at this time has a *colony* with executive and judicial officers occupying a defined territory nearly equal in area to three of the smaller States of the Union.'

To objection (1) Lord Granville replied that although it was true that the first article of the treaty had reference to a particular canal, yet by the eighth article the two countries declared that they '*not*

only desired in entering into the Convention to *accomplish* a particular object, but also to establish a *general principle*, and that 'they hereby agree to extend their protection by treaty stipulations to *any other* practical communications, whether by canal or railway, across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and *especially* to the interoceanic communications, should the same prove to be practicable, whether by canal or railway, which are now proposed to be established by the way of Tehuantepec or Panama.'

Mr. Frelinghuysen however refused to admit that the eighth article applied to any canal which 'might be built across the isthmus, and laid great stress on the phrase 'which are *now* proposed to be established,' which he said clearly meant the canals then in contemplation and named in the treaty. If this was so, why did the negotiators use the words '*any other* practical communication,' and in alluding to the proposed routes by way of Tehuantepec and Panama, why did they insert the word '*especially*' if they had not intended to extend their protection to *any* interoceanic communication which might at any time be opened between the two oceans?

In support of his second contention, Mr. Frelinghuysen revived the old question of the boundaries of British Honduras, and refused to admit that Great Britain had any right to the boundaries claimed by her, and that further, 'the United States had never given their consent to the conversion of the British "settlement" in Central America under Spanish-American sovereignty into a British "possession" under British sovereignty.'

No allusion was made by Mr. Frelinghuysen to the approval expressed by President Buchanan of the settlement of the boundaries of British Honduras by the Convention signed with Guatemala in 1859, and moreover Lord Granville was able to convict him of an inconsistency by pointing out that in 1869 the United States Government had formally recognised the legal existence of the *colony* of British Honduras, for on the 11th of August of that year a postal convention was concluded at Washington, in which it was stated that the Post Offices of the two countries were desirous of establishing and maintaining an exchange of mails between the United States on the one side and the *colony* of British Honduras on the other.

Shortly before the termination of President Arthur's Administration, Mr. Frelinghuysen attempted to bring matters to a crisis by negotiating a treaty with Nicaragua, whereby the United States assumed a virtual protectorate over that State, and acquired the right of constructing a canal under their own exclusive and, in fact, supreme control.

On Mr. Cleveland coming into office the following year he at once withdrew the treaty from the Senate for further consideration,

and did not resubmit it to that body. In his first Annual Message to Congress, the 8th of December, 1885, he stated the following reasons in support of his action :

Whatever highway may be constructed across the barrier dividing the two greatest maritime areas of the world must be for the world's benefit—a trust for mankind to be removed from the chance domination by any single Power, or become a point of invitation for hostilities, or a prize for warlike ambition. An engagement combining the construction, ownership, and operation of such a work by this Government with an offensive and defensive alliance for its protection with a foreign State, whose responsibilities and rights we would share, is, in my judgment, inconsistent with such dedication to universal and neutral use, and would, moreover, entail measures for its realisation beyond the scope of our national policy or present means.

There has been no further correspondence between the two Governments of any importance with regard to the treaty from that time until the present moment.

When we bear in mind the fact that in 1849 the United States Government in an official communication to Her Majesty's Government said, 'The United States would not, if they could, obtain any exclusive right or privilege in a great highway which naturally belonged to all mankind,' we see what a complete change has taken place in their policy with regard to the canal. The Clayton-Bulwer treaty, concluded as it was at a time when the United States desired no exclusive privileges, is therefore a great stumbling-block in the way of their new policy; there are a great many people in America who think that Great Britain is acting in a very unfriendly manner in not consenting to give up her rights under the treaty, and agree to its entire abrogation. They forget, however, that at the time when the Clayton-Bulwer treaty was concluded, Great Britain had large interests in Central America, and that the United States had practically none, and that these interests have since been given up in order to meet the views of the United States Government; and further, the Convention of February 1900 so modifies the Clayton-Bulwer treaty that the United States are given the right to construct and control a canal while England consents to remain under the prohibitions of Article I. of that treaty. It is only another case, however, of the old story so ably put by a late distinguished British lawyer, who, after several ineffectual attempts to come to some reciprocity agreement with the United States Government, exclaimed, 'Are British *rights* always to give way to American *sentiment*?' Nothing could more clearly describe the present situation. Great Britain has rights under the Clayton-Bulwer treaty on the American Isthmus, the United States have a sort of sentimental feeling that nothing ought to be allowed to 'stand in the way of anything the people want'; in fact, in a recent speech in Congress one of the supporters of the Hepburn Bill alluded to the Clayton-Bulwer treaty as 'an old treaty,' and said that the United States would not recognise a treaty that stood

in the way of public sentiment and public interest. This sentiment, combined with the Monroe doctrine, is chiefly accountable for the introduction of such Bills as the present into Congress.

Should the Hepburn Bill pass the Senate, it remains to be seen whether the President will hold the same view as President Cleveland did in 1885, when he withdrew the Frelinghuysen-Zavala treaty from the Senate owing to its terms being in contravention of the general principle laid down in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty. It is to be hoped that he will, and further, will find himself strong enough to induce the Senate to ratify the Convention of the 5th of February, 1900, unamended, and thereby place the United States in a position to construct a canal under conditions that cannot fail to meet with the approval of the whole world.

ROBERT BROMLEY.

VARYING IDEALS OF HUMAN BEAUTY

If we want to form an idea of what bygone races looked like, there is practically only one source of knowledge—the representations left of them by their artists. But artists are very untrustworthy folk: they are born idealists, and have a troublesome way of representing people, not as they are, but as they would like to be. They far too commonly, even in their portraiture, represent the race's ideal of beauty, rather than the actual appearance of the individuals of the race.

It is an interesting question how far this artistic ideal departs from the true racial type. Does it merely select the choicest specimens of the race, or does it invent a creature that has never existed?

For instance, does a Greek statue present to us merely an exceptionally handsome Greek man or woman, or is it what the Greek man or woman would have liked to resemble, but never did?

The question is not easy to answer with regard to the Greeks. Certainly the statue represents a possible human being, so why not the true racial type? Of course, at its best. But there have been other ideals which are impossible. For instance, there is the familiar early Victorian female ideal, to be found in the books of beauty and many fashionable portraits of the time. She is quite unlike any human being that has ever lived. The eyes are too big, the forehead is too high, the nose is too long, the mouth is too small, the neck is too long, the shoulders are too sloping, and the figure generally is fortunately impossible.

It was certainly a popular ideal; it was what the early Victorian lady wanted to look like; but if future historians imagine that she did look like that they will be grievously mistaken.

So it is obvious that we must be a little careful. Does the ideal merely mean a caricature of the prevailing type? No, not necessarily of the prevailing, but of the fashionable type. It is a caricature of the actual men and women who were most admired at the time.

We have an analogy from the sporting prints of the pre-photographic days. These represented an animal entirely unknown to natural history, but which sporting men accepted as a faithful likeness of a racehorse. If compared with a photograph of a racehorse it

will be seen at once to be grotesquely unlike the real thing, but yet these prints imposed upon men who were very shrewd judges of the animal itself.

The solution of the mystery is that they were accustomed to judge a horse by its points. The print exaggerated all these points, and made an impossible monstrosity; but the sporting man only saw that the points were there, only rather more so, and admired accordingly.

In judging representations of human beings the same principle obtains. At different times and in different civilisations certain points are popular, and in art—except in the very highest—these points are invariably exaggerated.

It is this exaggeration of the fashionable, rather than of the average, type of the race that constitutes for that race the ideal of human beauty. The form that this ideal takes is not merely of theoretical interest; it has a very important practical side.

Everyone tries to become like the fashionable ideal, and this endeavour often meets with a good deal of success. The power of adaptability latent in the female form especially has always struck me with admiring wonder. For instance, if the ideal has a small waist, most women will, somehow or other, have a small waist too, to the great detriment of their health and activity. On the other hand, a robust and athletic ideal can only be approached by healthy living and a good deal of outdoor exercise, to the immense gain of the idealists themselves and of their children after them.

There is also the marriage market to be considered. Matrimony has always been, in the rough, a matter of the choosing of favoured young women by the privileged sex. I regret that it is so. It is a bad system, and tends to make women sly and men insufferable. But the fact remains, nor in our civilisation, with its unfortunate preponderance of women, is it likely to get any better.

This power of choice on the part of the man being assumed, it is obviously a public misfortune if he admires an unhealthy and unsatisfactory type of young woman. For on the average he is sure to marry her—to the detriment of the race.

Of course this applies also to the female ideal of man. It is as well that women should admire a good type of man, but owing to their inferior freedom of choice it is of less importance.

I commend these considerations to my brother artists. For Heaven's sake let their ideal types be healthy, whatever else they be. If the decadent artists ever succeed in making their monstrosities fashionable it will go far to ruin England.

Having thus demonstrated, as I fondly trust, the extreme gravity and interest of my subject, I will proceed to treat it in its main historical aspects.

The most stable artistic type ever known was undoubtedly that

of ancient Egypt. It lasted, with very slight variations, for literally thousands of years.

One curious thing about this rigidly conventionalised art is that it began with a very sturdy realism. Some of the earliest statues are singularly free from convention, and show a fine feeling for individual portraiture.

I will instance the celebrated figure of the Scribe now at the Louvre. It is one of the earliest of all historical monuments, and yet how modern it is, and how admirable!

If Egyptian art could only have progressed in this direction what wonders might we not have seen!

I once asked a very eminent man of science how he accounted for this extraordinary early promise of Egyptian art so soon getting stifled into the most rigid conventionality.

'My dear man,' he replied, 'it got into the hands of the parsons.'

I have no doubt that this is the true explanation. Art was a function of the priestly caste, and innovation became heresy.

But, curiously enough, this very devotion of art to the service of religion in one way tended to preserve that realistic feeling that we have noticed as one of its earliest characteristics.

The Egyptian belief in a future life was of a very material nature. Every man had a Ka, or double, which was a kind of soul, but this soul could not subsist as an absolutely disembodied spirit. It must have a solid substratum, as it were; as long as the man's body endured the spirit was all right. Hence the mummifying of the corpse and elaborate precautions with regard to sepulture. But even if the body decayed he had a second chance. At a pinch the Ka could make shift with another body. This was best provided by a statue of the deceased, which was buried with him, and, being made of some hard material, could be trusted to give him a very tolerable measure of immortality. But the statue had to be sufficiently like to prevent the Ka making any mistake about it. So in these funeral effigies there is generally a certain amount of individuality about the head. This being sufficient for recognition, the body was conventionalised, and represented an average man or woman in the prime of life. Occasionally, however, if there were any great peculiarity in the body, it would be reproduced in the effigy. For instance, a dwarf would have a dwarf statue.

This belief, as I have said, tended to realism, but it was not strong enough to stem the tide of conventionality that finally overwhelmed the whole of Egyptian art.

Only once or twice does this conventionality at all break down. The most striking case is during the reign of the heretic, Amenophis the Fourth. This monarch was a radical and a reformer of the deepest dye, who endeavoured to sweep away the very complicated

superstitions of his people, and to substitute for them the comparatively simple worship of the Solar disk. It is a striking evidence of the strength of the monarchical principle in ancient Egypt that for a time he was successful in his innovations. This relaxation of the bonds of orthodoxy had a very curious effect on art, so much so that in his capital of Tel-el-Amarna there have been found paintings and bas-reliefs that display an astonishing vigour and freedom from convention. There are also portrait statues of the reformer that appear to render his very unprepossessing face and form with the utmost fidelity.

But the movement did not last. No doubt the priestly caste was too strong. Egypt returned to its polytheism, and art to its conventionality. But it is precisely this conventionality that is so interesting, for it gives us the Egyptian ideal of the human form.

How shall we describe this ideal? In face the men and women were very much alike, but there is a subtle charm about the female faces that is replaced by a placid dignity in the male. In both the features are delicate and of a somewhat aquiline type, and the figures are tall and slight. There is very little indication of muscle, but the men are broad-shouldered and thin-flanked, whilst the women, in spite of their stiff attitudes, are graceful and refined. In both, the forms are soft and rounded. The resemblance between the men and women is of course increased by the men being always clean shaven.

In the paintings and bas-reliefs there are certain conventions which do not apply to the statues, and for these due allowance has to be made.

In early times all drawing and painting on the flat (and bas-relief is but a form of this) had to serve two purposes. One was to convey information, the other to be ornamental. It is doubtful which is the earlier of the two. The man of the stone age, when he scratched his realistic mammoth on a piece of reindeer bone, either wanted to convey to his brother man that he had seen a fine specimen of this interesting animal, or else he did it because he thought it pretty; or he may have had both motives. In any case we have here the common origin of art and writing.

The information picture dwindles down through hieroglyphics to mere symbols of sounds, the pictorial origin of which is entirely lost. The decorative picture gradually loses all wish to convey information, and subsists entirely for its pleasure to the eye. But the Egyptians had not got so far as that; when they drew a man, there had to be no mistake what it was. He had all to be displayed, as it were, to the best advantage. The legs were shown sideways, so as to give the whole length of the feet, and one leg was put in front of the other, so that neither should be concealed. Then there came a difficulty about the body; if that were sideways too, one shoulder would be lost; so the body must be seen frontways. The arms, again, are best

seen sideways ; fortunately, as both shoulders are shown, they do not interfere with one another. Again, a profile is more characteristic than a full face, but a profile eye is a poor foreshortened thing. So in this profile we insert an eye seen to its full extent, and then we really have done the man justice. This eye, seen full face while the head is profile, gives naturally a peculiar expression, which makes people talk of the long, narrow eyes of the ancient Egyptians. They very likely had nothing of the kind. Then, again, the twisting of the body makes the shoulders seem too broad. The ideal is certainly broad-shouldered, but not so much so as this would make it appear.

Of course there are occasional variations from this type, but on the whole it is so uniform and so persistent that I think we must assume that it was settled by a kind of standard to which all sculptors and draughtsmen had to conform on pain of heresy. The chief alteration that affected this standard was that it became slimmer in course of time, until under the Ptolemies a very elongated type was fashionable.

It is interesting to contrast with this over-refined and bloodless type the more vigorous and coarser art of Assyria. Here the figures are short and thick, and the muscles are strongly accentuated. The men are heavily bearded, with luxuriant curly hair ; the features are of a pronounced Jewish type, and the whole effect is that of great muscular strength and manly vigour. There are hardly any representations of women. This very masculine art appears to have considered them unworthy of notice.

As with the Egyptians, the type is very uniform, but it persists for a much shorter time, and the art is on the whole less conventional.

No doubt a sturdy race and one that valued strength and vigour above all other qualities. So the artists, with their usual trick of flattery, exaggerated this sturdiness, much in the same way that the Egyptian artists exaggerated slimness and refinement.

The two races probably differed in physique far less than their artistic remains would seem to imply.

After the Persian conquest of Assyria we find the same type persisting in the representations of the conquerors, but in a very much weakened form. Persian art seems purely derivative from the Assyrian, and shows the natural decadence of an imitation.

Of course the most important and influential ideal of human beauty that has ever been evolved was that of the Greeks. It remains to this day the ultimate standard for all European civilisation, and its influence in favour of health and sanity can hardly be over-estimated. Alas ! we fall away from it all too frequently, and worship false gods and especially false goddesses ; admiring, to our shame, mere quaintness or prettiness, or worse. Nay, we even find beauty in morbid and neurotic types that seem to have stepped out of the hospital or the madhouse. But we always return in our better

moments to the worship of the Venus of Milo; and no man could have a saner or a healthier love.

Of course the Greeks were some time working up to their magnificent ideals. Their early art was no doubt derived from Asiatic sources. The remains of it are scanty, and so various that it is difficult to pitch upon any special archaic type.

But even in the earliest specimens one feels that this Art is alive; above all, that it has that element of healthy realism without which no art can progress. There seems to be no definite pattern to which all works must conform; individual sculptors arise who, instead of blindly copying their predecessors, go to nature for their inspiration; and they have a public who appreciates these efforts; a life-like gesture is applauded; truth is esteemed the highest merit in a work of art.

When Myron produced his celebrated statue of the runner Ladas falling dead as he reached the goal, it was hailed at once as a triumph of realism. It seemed as if the last breath from the empty lungs was passing the lips of the dying man.

I lay stress on this essential naturalism of the Greeks, as I am convinced that it is the only sound foundation for an ideal type. The majestic creations of Phidias were not portraits of actual Athenians, but they were founded on an extraordinarily close observation of individuals, not only on the part of the master himself, but also of his forerunners and contemporaries.

It is this that gives the essential vitality to the Phidian ideal, and saves it from any reproach of cold and abstract formalism. The remains left us of the work of this great artist are so much injured that, although they fully convey to us his mastery over the figure, we can only guess at the splendour of the heads.

In his own time the most highly esteemed of the statues of Phidias was the Olympian Zeus. It was of enormous dimensions and of chryselephantine workmanship: that is, the flesh was represented by a thin veneer of ivory, and the drapery was gilded.

The statue has been irretrievably lost, but the type of Zeus has been perpetuated by Roman imitations. It represents a man in the full prime of life, with flowing beard and hair. It has been unfortunately vulgarised by these imitations, but we can well imagine that in the hands of the master himself it was a creation of unsurpassable majesty.

The similar statue of Athene has also disappeared, but here again there are Roman busts that convey probably a very good idea of the type of head. This also is extraordinarily noble, but in the reproductions appears to have a certain cold formality that was probably absent from the original.

These statues are both fully draped. To show the treatment of the figure by Phidias we must refer to the statues commonly called

Theseus and Ulysses in the British Museum. They represent the perfection of strength without any undue development of muscle—perfectly well-grown and well-proportioned examples of vigorous early manhood.

For the treatment of the female figure we have not the same material, but the remains from the Parthenon show enough of the form beneath the draperies to convince us that the women of Phidias were worthy of the men.

For a full comprehension of the Greek ideal of the female figure we must go to a later statue, the so-called Venus of Milo, which is probably by a pupil of Praxiteles.

Unfortunately the arms are missing, but the head and the torso are practically complete, and as such form an ideal of womanhood that has never been excelled. I may mention that the tip of the nose has been restored, and that the restoration is an atom too long. This should be taken into account in judging of the perfection of the head.

The head is certainly less severe than the Phidian ideal. Its predominant expression is that of calm graciousness. The body is vigorous and robust. In proportion it differs but little from the male, but it is very feminine in the graceful roundness of its contours. It especially resembles the male figure in that it has no waist. Indeed we may take it that the Greek woman never knew she had a waist, and that her garments were designed without the smallest reference to this imaginary division of the figure. The whole aspect of the statue seems to breathe health and sanity; nor is it devoid of a special feminine charm—at least to all right-minded people.

A worthy pendant to it is the celebrated Hermes of Praxiteles, which gives very completely the Greek conception of a young man.

The head is less ideal than the Phidian type, and is certainly devoid of that abstract formalism that is sometimes imputed to Greek art.

It looks quite individual, and might almost be a portrait of some exceptionally good-looking young man. The figure is a little younger and softer than the Phidian type, but is nevertheless perfectly vigorous and athletic.

Within certain limits there is a great variety in Greek art, and it would be easy to multiply instances of ideal figures which show marked individuality. The best statues are far indeed from being all of one pattern, but the conception of the highest beauty that they display is essentially of one type, which can best be described as the healthy human body in its most complete and harmonious development.

That the actual Greeks approached very closely to this type

may be doubted, but they were certainly a handsome and well-developed race.

What they really looked like we can judge better from the little Tanagra figures, which display a good deal of the beauty and grace of the statues without any of their dignity. We see from them that a self-respecting young Greek woman could have a turned-up nose and perhaps a double chin, but she must not be fat and clumsy, nor bony and angular, if she did not wish to be outside the pale of even this humble and domestic art.

The Romans, who had practically no art of their own, or at the most a very poor one, simply took over Greek art *en bloc*, and it is interesting to see that the Greek ideal was maintained in all its purity without being at all influenced by the racial peculiarities of its patrons, who were probably of a much heavier and coarser build. This is an interesting proof that an artistic ideal need not represent the type of the race that honours it. But it is better for art that it should. No doubt some of the coldness and formality that distinguish Roman work may be traced to the divorce of art from its subject-matter.

This imitative tendency of the Romans, although far from praiseworthy in itself, has the great advantage for us that it supplemented by innumerable copies the somewhat meagre remains of Greek art. Indeed, were it not for the Romans we should have no idea of what Greek painting was like. It is true that the frescoes of Pompeii are but the faint imitations done by the journeyman painters of a provincial town of the works of the great Greek masters, but such as they are they are purely Greek in spirit. With all their imperfect drawing and flimsy execution, they have an extraordinary sense of beauty that makes one all the more regret the irretrievable loss of the great examples of this lovely art.

And so this ideal of the Greeks persisted in an alien race, gradually growing more formal and less life-like until all art decayed and the dark ages spread over Europe like a funeral pall.

When this pall has begun to lift we find that a new art has been born that owes but little to its magnificent predecessor. A very babyish art at first, brought up under the shadow of superstition and slave to an ignorant priesthood. And yet it has vitality. The mere fact that it is so little reminiscent of its classical origin is in its favour; any attempt at imitation of the Greeks would have been beyond its power, nor, indeed, were its surroundings compatible with any sane and healthy ideal.

The great characteristic of mediæval art, as opposed to the classical, is the curious awkwardness and uncouthness of the form and gestures. In the early specimens it is extraordinarily stiff and rigid; in later examples we find more movement, sometimes a superabundance of it; but it is never by any chance easy and graceful like the movement

of the Greeks. Mediæval gestures are invariably grotesque; they are not so stereotyped as those of the Egyptians and Assyrians, but they show an almost equal lack of any close observation of nature. The heads are mostly of a poor type, though often pleasing from a certain naïveté of expression which was probably not intended by the artist. The figures are almost invariably misshapen.

This is one of the extraordinary changes that had come over European civilisation. In the classical times the body was esteemed and cultivated. In the middle ages asceticism was so rampant that the body was despised. This again reacted upon dress, so that the mediæval costume was entirely opposed to the classical. The latter was always of the nature of drapery, an adjunct to, rather than a concealer of the figure. It was very little shaped, and was so worn as to hang in the natural folds given to it by the form beneath. The mediæval costume was mostly so elaborately and fancifully shaped that it was difficult to form any true idea of the body that it so effectually covered.

It is true that this body was mostly a very poor one—what with plague and famine and dirt and unwholesome surroundings. So, perhaps, the folk of the middle ages did well to concentrate attention on their garments rather than on themselves. But the result of it all is that in mediæval art there is no feeling at all for a fine human figure. In the few cases where the nude is portrayed, it is made simply ugly and grotesque. The heads are better than the figures, but, take it all together, it may be confidently said that during the middle ages the ideal of human beauty was a very poor one. On the other hand, the feeling for inanimate beauty was very great. Architecture of course attained a surprising, indeed an almost unaccountable, development and all the decorative arts had an originality and a vitality that were probably unsurpassed even in the classical times. I am not running down the art of the middle ages, which indeed, in many of its developments, I admire immensely. It is merely with reference to its human ideal that I find it so sadly wanting.

It is interesting to note that Gothic art in Italy was never so purely Gothic as in other countries. It seems as if the classical leaven still worked in it. At the worst, in Italy it is never absolutely ugly. Giotto's figures, stiff as they are, have a certain grace and dignity very foreign to most Gothic work; even the earlier Cimabue is not devoid of charm.

That the Italians never quite lost the classical ideal is shown by the fact that Niccolò Pisano, working as early as 1260, distinctly anticipated the Renaissance by giving to his bas-reliefs a quite unmistakably classical quality, a quality that was somewhat but not entirely lost by his successors.

We may take it that throughout the middle ages the Italians

displayed much more feeling for human beauty than any of the northern nations; so, when the Renaissance came, they were able to take full advantage of the renewal of the Greek ideal that was one of the great features of that extraordinary time.

There is, perhaps, no more charming epoch in Art than that of the early Renaissance in Italy. It seems as if beauty and gaiety were born again, that the wholesome delight in life which was the best side of the classic civilisation had finally conquered the gloomy horrors of the dark ages. The great god Pan revisited the earth, and for a time seemed destined to dethrone the hoofed and horned abomination who had succeeded him. The Saints themselves seemed humanised; they are now pleasing and debonair personages, with even an occasional suggestion of pagan good humour, and the angels are quite charming; not even Pompeian dancing girls have a more delicate grace.

Of course Art is still pious; the Church is too powerful for it not to be—but it wears its piety with a difference. It is more like the easy religion of the Roman gentleman who worshipped his gods as a gentleman should, but didn't lose his temper or his digestion over it.

This charm of the early Renaissance is most fully embodied in Sandro Botticelli. Can anything be more delightful than the delicate paganism of his 'Spring' or of 'The birth of Venus'? and how refreshing after the angular and sour-visaged saints of the middle ages! The 'Spring,' indeed, is by some people held to be the most beautiful picture in the world. It is certainly one of the most charming, and it undoubtedly excels in subtlety and delicacy the classic art from which it derives its inspiration. But from our present point of view it is not wholly commendable. The types are charming enough, but distinctly they are not very healthy. These lanky young women look ill-nourished and deficient in muscle; their faces are thin and pallid; their very subtlety has a suspicion of hysteria. Fascinating they are, but think of them as wives and mothers in comparison with the 'Venus of Milo'! I love them very much, but I mistrust them not a little.

It is to be noted that although mediæval angularity and uncouthness have disappeared from the art of the Renaissance, the attitudes and gestures have not quite attained the rhythmic ease of the best classic work. They are now graceful enough, but this grace is often a little affected.

In Botticelli it is apt to be somewhat stiff. In others it is exaggerated and theatrical—in the later Renaissance very markedly so.

The secret of the wonderful measure and restraint of the Greeks seems to have perished with them; no modern artist has ever quite achieved it.

The transition from the early to the later Renaissance is marked by a much greater amplitude and robustness of form.

It can be traced very well in Raphael, whose early work is of the slim and refined order, but he very soon gets more influenced by classical ideals and also by his great contemporary Michael Angelo, so that in his later works the figures are of an extremely brawny type. To tell the truth, Raphael's later ideal of the human form is distinctly coarse; the heads are often mere copies of the antique, and not very good copies either.

It is in his early and middle periods that he shows such a fine choice of form and face, but it is always to me a little artificial; but then no doubt he suffers from the amount of imitation that the popularity of his work has produced.

His rival, Michael Angelo, was a man of finer genius, whose mastery over the human form was scarcely less than that of the great Greek artists; but unfortunately he lacked entirely their feeling for measure and proportion. His work suffers from a certain wilful exaggeration. The proportions of his figures are not human. The bodies are much too large and powerful for their heads and extremities. Their muscles are overdone, so are their attitudes, but with it all they never degenerate into the coarseness of type that I maintain is to be found in Raphael's later work. It is the exaggeration of a man of impulsive genius whose conceptions are so vivid and powerful that they destroy his sense of measure.

Certainly Michael Angelo's figures are extraordinarily impressive, but the impression is not produced, as in the Greek statues, by quite legitimate means.

The third great figure of the full Renaissance, Leonardo da Vinci, has the distinction of having originated one of the most remarkable types of beauty that the world has ever seen. This type was no mere abstraction, nor did it owe anything to the antique. It was undoubtedly founded on an actual woman, the *Monna Lisa* of the subtle eyes and enchanting smile. His ideal faces do not precisely reproduce the lady's features, but they all have her smile.

It is an exceedingly beautiful type. It has not the robust perfection of the Greeks, but it is quite free from that suspicion of ill-health that one finds in Botticelli. The features are regular and extraordinarily delicate, and the form is exquisitely proportioned. And then the smile! It is quite indescribable and entirely fascinating.

This beautiful type persists, with modifications, in the works of Leonardo's followers, notably in Luini, in whose hands it loses none of its charm, though perhaps a little of its strength.

If we turn to the great Venetian school, we find a very magnificent type of beauty of the robust and somewhat sensual order. In many ways it has more of the spirit of the antique than have the directer copies of Raphael. Titian's '*Flora*' might be a somewhat fleshy sister of the *Venus of Milo*. There is no subtlety and

certainly no hysteria about these splendid women, but they look as if they might have taken a little more exercise with advantage. Their colouring, of course, is superb; here the Greeks are at a disadvantage. We can only guess at the colouring of their goddesses, but we gather from the poets that they were fair-haired. It is odd how persistently the supreme ideal of female beauty is fair. There are many very beautiful dark women in the world, and certainly in Venice the prevailing type must have been then, as it is now, dark-haired; but these splendid brunettes were not satisfied with their natural beauties. They sat in the fierce Venetian sun with their raven locks spread out over the brim of an enormous crownless hat, until they bleached them with the aid of various cunning unguents to the beautiful red gold colour so beloved of the painters, and probably got frightful headaches in the process—which is an example of how women somehow or other manage to conform to their ideals. Well, it is a very lovely ideal, and I am inclined to agree with them that if nature did not give them hair like that it was their sacred duty to improve upon nature.

The men of the Venetian painters were fine, dignified gentlemen, but not so remarkable in their looks as the women.

In Northern Europe the Renaissance came a little later than in Italy, and for a long time it did not break so completely with mediæval methods, and what is most interesting from my present point of view is that the feeling for human beauty is everywhere deficient compared with Italy. It is only in that favoured country that we find a really fine ideal. The other nations, however admirable their schools of painting may be, are all far below her in that one quality. The cause of this is obscure, but I have little doubt that at the time of the Renaissance the Italian was the handsomest race in Europe, so that the painters had better models to choose from; but what was probably of greater importance was that the classical influence never entirely died out, and also that Italy was full of the remains of ancient art.

Take the Van Eycks: they were admirable painters, but how devoid of personal charm are their creations as compared with their Italian contemporaries! Holbein, again, was a great painter—as a portrait-painter one of the very greatest. But decidedly his portraits do not err in the direction of flattering his sitters. I cannot help thinking that an Italian painter of equal power would have made the fine ladies and gentlemen of the English Court a little more attractive in appearance. For instance, it is difficult to believe that Anne Boleyn had not more charm in the flesh than in Holbein's drawing, admirable as it is.

Durer, again, was a fine painter, in many ways quite the equal of his Italian rivals; but either his models were very plain-featured Germans, or else he failed to make the best of the materials at his disposal. Although the Northern artists sometimes, but not often,

produced fine heads, their treatment of the nude figure was almost invariably ugly. Durer's Adam and Eve are quite dreadful people.

On coming to the seventeenth century we find that the supremacy of painting has departed from Italy to be divided between Spain and Holland. The two greatest artists of the time are Velasquez and Rembrandt—some would say, the greatest artists of all time. This view I do not share on account of the very consideration that I am going to bring forward. But they are certainly two of the greatest masters of the painter's craft that have ever lived. They both, however, have the serious weakness that their sense of human beauty is so small. Their appreciation of the beauty of light and shade, of colour, of texture, of expression, and their power of rendering these beauties are miraculous, but an ugly human being seems to have been much the same to them as a handsome one. Velasquez could not only complacently multiply his portraits of his unwholesome-looking patron, but he even revelled in painting the unfortunate dwarfs and idiots that, to the disgrace of Spanish civilisation, were the chief sources of amusement at the dismal Court of Philip the Fourth. In the whole range of Velasquez's art there are very few noble-looking heads, and there is certainly not one really pretty woman. His highest conception of the human figure is to be found in his 'Apollo at the forge of Vulcan'—and a very odd conception it is. That an Apollo! It is enough to make a Greek artist writhe in his grave.

And Rembrandt too. How few good-looking people there seem to have been amongst his numberless sitters! A fine man's head here and there—a passable Dutch maiden with a pleasant face very occasionally. But of real beauty, male or female, hardly a trace. And then his feeling for the figure! He was rather fond of doing Susannahs bathing and such like; but oh! such terrible women as he made them! Such clumsy, coarse, misshapen creatures! and so superbly painted!

Nor are matters better when we turn to Rubens—to my mind an overrated painter, though of course his vigour and dexterity are amazing. His women are decidedly handsomer than Rembrandt's: the heads are often of a fine buxom blonde type. But the figures! He is, I think, the only painter of distinction who has ever delighted in portraying fat women—positively fat! There is no other word for it; and he revels in it.

His great pupil, Vandyke, had a much finer sense of beauty. He is particularly successful, in his portraits, in giving a certain type of refined aristocratic beauty. A little too much so, for he was the first portrait-painter who seems to have deliberately flattered his sitters. His ideal figures, however, are quite commonplace. They have not the coarseness of Rubens, but they have nothing else much to recommend them.

After Vandyke comes the day of small things in Art, which lasts

in England until the middle of the eighteenth century, when there suddenly arises perhaps the most charming school of portraiture that has ever existed.

I say 'most *charming*' advisedly, but certainly not the greatest. Reynolds, Gainsborough, and Romney lived in too artificial an age to produce the highest art, but this very artificiality gives a dainty grace that is in some ways more attractive than the robust truthfulness of the greatest schools of painting. It is precisely in this quality of truthfulness that the work of this exquisite group of painters falls short. They flattered their sitters abominably. Then their productiveness was so immense that in all but their finest work they scamped everything but the head. Indeed, they adopted the fatal practice of having draperies, backgrounds, and even hands painted for them by their assistants—generally without the presence of the sitter. All this gives a certain unreality to their portraiture, but makes it all the more interesting from our present point of view, as these pictures of concrete humanity are made to conform more or less to an ideal type; which is much the same for all three masters, and probably represents very accurately the fashionable form of beauty of the time, as modified by the refined taste of three men of undoubted genius. The male portraits have more individuality than the female, so they do not display the same tendency to conform to a type. In general it may be said of them that the faces are apt to be a little fatuous and are mostly very well nourished, and that the older men seem to be fortunate in avoiding wrinkles; none of the faces are much lined.

But the women seem to be all of one family, the members of which are not often handsome and are never quite plain. They are never fat, they are never broad-shouldered, they are never robust in any way. They seldom look very intellectual, but they never look foolish, and they generally have a particular charm of expression that makes one forget that their features are not really fine and that their bodies are mostly very poor and weedy. They all look moderately good, and seem very lively and good-tempered.

In sheer beauty of face the work of Gainsborough is supreme; on the other hand, his figures are the weediest of all.

Romney had the enormous advantage of having a very beautiful model, of whom he made countless studies. If it were not for the pictures of Lady Hamilton his work would certainly fall below the level of the other two.

The ideal figures of these admirable portrait painters are mostly poor; ill-drawn and conventional to a surprising degree.

The fact is, their portraits were quite sufficiently removed from nature; when they were relieved from the constraint of having a definite sitter to depict their artificiality became excessive.

About the same time, or rather a little earlier, there arose a school

in France with somewhat the same aims and characteristics, but on the whole very inferior to ours.

The earliest and the greatest master of the school is Watteau, who in his way is a painter of undoubted genius; Lancret, too, was a fine painter, but I have never been able to bestow much admiration on the other masters, such as Boucher, Fragonard, and the rest.

They differed from the English school in not being chiefly portrait-painters, but they had the same feeling for the charm of a very artificial femininity set in a background of equally artificial landscape. The women of the English painters, however, are far more attractive than the soulless minxes who disport themselves so coquetishly in the French canvases of the period.

On the whole, this French type is a very poor one. The expression of the face is vivacious and not unpleasing, but the features are never fine, and there is no trace of intellect in the heads. The forms are soft and rounded, but have not much else to recommend them, and the grace of the attitudes is of a painfully artificial nature.

This very mannered school received an added touch of spurious sentiment and descended to a still lower depth of artificiality in Greuze, who is to me one of the most offensive of painters, and yet there is no denying that the type he invented and repeated with such wearisome iteration is a pretty one. It generally represents a young girl about fourteen or fifteen, a time of life that has been avoided by painters as being neither one thing nor the other—neither child nor woman. But for that very reason Greuze seems to delight in it. He invests it with a false innocence and a real coquetry that seem to me singularly out of place in such childish creatures. But pretty they are, in a sort of large-eyed, small-mouthed manner. And then came the Revolution, with its curious revival of classicism, and these hot-house women of the *ancien régime* got swept away for ever both in nature and in art.

To return to England, the tradition of Sir Joshua and the others was carried on by Sir Thomas Lawrence in an unfortunately vulgarised form. The type is, if anything, more artificial; but the charm, except in the very best of his pictures, has evaporated. They are painted with an extraordinary ability of a very tricky and flashy kind. And then we gradually descend into the mere inanities of the early Victorian era.

And now we come to the Moderns. What shall we say of them? Have we an ideal of beauty at all? If we have, it is of a very varied kind. The day of definite schools and of more or less stable fashions seems to have gone. At any rate we are not monotonous, and out of all this chaos we may evolve an ideal some day that will be all the better for the wide range of types from which it is selected.

But we have not found it yet.

JOHN COLLIER.

CURRENT POLITICS

I

A LIBERAL VIEW

LAST month! Last month, indeed; the last of the year and the last of the century. When one is writing the word 'Finis' at the close of the record of such an epoch as the Nineteenth Century, something more than a review of the events of the last few days of that period is naturally demanded. It is a century which will play a large part in the story of the Empire and the world; but what is of more immediate interest to us is the fact that it has been *our* century, the century in which we have lived and worked and taken our part, be it great or small. We cannot dismiss it as we might any former century known only through the written pages of the historian. It has been so much a part of ourselves that we cannot take leave of it without a certain degree of emotion. Many of us remember it when it was still but half-way through its strange eventful history. I can still hear lingering in my memory the firing of the minute guns as they announced the death of Queen Adelaide, more than fifty years ago, and I have talked familiarly with men and women who were in their prime when the century that has just expired was born—men who had heard the voice of Pitt, women who had seen the Prince of Wales and Sheridan in the ball-room at Brighton, some who had shaken hands with Robert Burns and listened to Walter Scott as he read the *Lay of the Last Minstrel* from a manuscript as yet unpublished. It is impossible to pass such a milestone as that which we have reached to-day without pausing to look back to the point where another milestone like it can be dimly descried through the gathering mists of time. Above all, it is impossible to avoid the note of personal feeling and experience when one knows that the century which is now numbered with the ages that are gone is that in which our own lot has been cast and with which our own careers must be identified.

We have just passed through a month that has been not uneventful, a month in which even the dullest must be conscious of the fact that he has seen history in the making. It has been a

month, too, in which the first tiny shoots of more than one new movement, that may either be withered prematurely by some untimely frost or preserved to grow to full maturity, have become visible above the surface. Before we touch upon these things one looks back instinctively for a hundred years, to the time when our fathers were watching the passing of the Eighteenth Century as we now watch the birth of the Twentieth. Historians tell us that the year 1800 began with hot disputes as to whether it was the first day of the new century or the last of the old one. The wise men of Europe were greatly agitated by the contention, until the astronomers came in and settled it authoritatively by the decree that 1801, not 1800, must be regarded as the first year of the Nineteenth Century. It seems strange now-a-days that the old generation could have interested themselves in such a question, considering the times in which they lived. A hundred years ago History seemed to be wearing its seven-league boots and striding onwards with a rapidity which might well have left most mortals without breath to waste on pettifogging disputations of no practical importance. Buonaparte—they still spelt the name in the Italian fashion in 1800—was overawing the Directory, placing himself at the head of the Grand Army, crossing the Alps, and fighting the battle of Marengo, events which even now stand out like mountains in the march of the ages. England was still shivering in apprehension of that invasion of her shores which was something more than a vision of the panic-stricken; but despite her alarms she was playing her part in the great world with her accustomed stubborn resolution, as the capture of Malta and the preparations for the expedition which was to drive the French from Egypt proved. Pitt was Prime Minister, and the year was that which saw the legislative union of England and Ireland accomplished by the lavish expenditure of that English gold which our enemies abroad dreaded almost as much as English steel. But it was not upon historic events like these that the minds of the King and his people were fixed in 1800. There was something still nearer to their hearts than the conquest of an island in the Mediterranean or the union of the British and Irish Parliaments. This was what in after-days came to be known as 'the condition of the people question.' In the King's speech at the opening of the Session of 1800 the only topic that found special mention was the price of food. It was a topic that well deserved this melancholy pre-eminence; for in that year wheat stood at 128s. the quarter, or exactly 100s. more than that at which it figures in the price list of Mark Lane to-day. Was it wonderful that those who made our laws should feel themselves driven by the pressure of national want to try every kind of remedy that wisdom or folly could suggest for the poverty and suffering of the nation? So we find, as we look

as criminals for having broken the law that forbade a man who had bought food-stuff at a certain price to sell it on the same day and at the same place at a higher, or for dealing in 'futures' in hops or grain. By such pitiful devices did our ancestors seek to abate the pinch of hunger which was felt as a grim reality in almost every cottage in the land.

Those Englishmen who sat down at the close of December 1800 to review the state of their country must have felt that the survey was by no means cheerful. The century that was drawing to a close had seen England overtaken by many misfortunes. The loss of the American colonies had been a blow to the national pride of the sorest kind; the military and naval struggles of the last decade had seemed to tax our resources to the uttermost, and none knew how much longer the sword was to continue to dominate the Continent; but, above all, the state of our domestic affairs was lamentable. Political parties were sharply divided, and the most brilliant leader of the Opposition was in open sympathy with the enemies of the country, whilst the sufferings of the poor had reached a stage at which it seemed impossible that they could be longer endured. One can imagine the amiable diarist of that day shaking his head sadly over the actual condition of the country and the prospect before it. What would he have thought if he had known that Britain was only at the beginning of a long period of war and peril, that the First Consul was soon to blossom into an Emperor who was to make himself the dictator of Europe, and that fifteen years of constant struggle and ever-increasing privation were to elapse before England could secure the blessed fruits of peace on the field of Waterloo? As one looks back upon that period it seems marvellous that our country—no world-empire then, but a single little island in the northern sea—was able to bear the strain to which both its resources and its courage were subjected. Many of us are old enough to remember the long peace which followed the overthrow of Napoleon, and those who do so can bear witness to the fact that it was the peace of a common exhaustion rather than the repose which is the legitimate reward of victory. The wealth of Europe, in blood and brain and muscle, as well as in money, had been poured out so freely during the awful years of war that when peace came the nations were left in a state of depletion resembling that of the fever patient whose blood has been let too freely by the surgeon. And in this condition there sprang up not unnaturally a profound abhorrence of war. Many of us can remember how thirty years after Napoleon had been sent to St. Helena the British Army, in which there was still many a veteran who bore the Waterloo medal on his breast, was regarded with almost open contempt and dislike by the public. The Commander-in-Chief himself believed

either from the scum of the nation or from reckless young men who had allowed themselves to be cajoled when under the influence of drink into taking the Queen's shilling. When once a man had enlisted he was regarded by his family and friends as being lost to them for life. The Yeomanry, which had been relied upon in the days of great national emergency as an important branch of the army of defence, had fallen into such contempt that when the members of the different corps during their few days of annual training appeared in the streets in uniform they were everywhere pursued with insulting and mocking cries. In all these things could be read proofs of the terrible reaction which had followed the strain of the Great War. In the political world signs of the same 'swing of the pendulum' were to be seen in the great political and economic reforms which had wrested power from the hands of the privileged few and opened up those new avenues of trade and industry that were eventually to be the means by which our fabulous national wealth was at last poured in upon us. The philosophic observer of a hundred years ago could, of course, no more have foreseen these things than he could have foreseen the fifteen years of sanguinary fighting with which the century began. Nay, if in some prophetic dream, such as Holy Writ describes, they had been unfolded before his eyes, he would no more have understood their meaning than he would have understood how men could speak to each other by means of the telephone, or send intelligible signals through the air by an invisible and immaterial system of telegraphy. But we have seen them. Their story is written for us in the chronicles of that Nineteenth Century whose epitaph is now to be penned. One wonders whether, having seen and learned, we have really understood—have grasped the true meaning of the lessons which the history of the century teaches us. A certain friend of mine, who is at once more of a philosopher and more of a man of affairs than I pretend to be, reproaches me at times because of my belief in the swing of the pendulum as a rule that influences, if it does not govern, the movements of public opinion. Yet I may plead in defence of my faith that the story of the last hundred years shows us the pendulum in full swing. The long war was followed by the long peace, during which the nation slowly recovered from the exhaustion that it had caused. Then, when our commerce had revived under the policy of free trade, and the working-man no longer felt the pinch of hunger in his house, there was a partial revival of the old passions, and we allowed ourselves to drift into the calamitous blunder of the Crimean war. That was but a partial and abortive movement of the pendulum, but a quarter of a century later it was in full swing again. With an ever-increasing commercial prosperity, and with the completion of the work of the political reformers, men began to look abroad anew, the narrow interests of

their own hearths no longer absorbed their thoughts as they had done in times of poverty and depression; we were once more a full-blooded race, conscious of our destinies and our place in the world, and eager to undertake any task that might add to our substantial greatness as a people. And so, as the Nineteenth Century ends, the clock seems to have completed its revolution, and we find ourselves standing in a position not wholly unlike that in which our fathers stood a hundred years ago. We have a serious war actually upon our hands; we are confronted by many grave dangers abroad, not in Europe only, but in the West and in the Far East; at home, despite our enormous wealth, omens are to be seen that bid us prepare for less prosperous days. Perhaps, to complete the parallel, I should say that now, as in 1800, there is a section of Englishmen who sympathise openly with the enemies we are confronting in the field. But that section is a small one, and it has no Fox to lead it. Be this as it may, the student of history cannot but feel that the lessons of the Nineteenth Century have a special significance for those who now stand on the threshold of the Twentieth.

• It is curious that the year 1900 should in one respect provide a close parallel to the story of 1800. Once more we have taken a step forward in the unification of the Empire. The arrival of Lord Hopetoun on the great Australian Continent has evoked a widespread demonstration of enthusiasm among the newly federated colonies, and exactly a century after the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland we are celebrating the union of the hitherto divided States of Australia. But if anything is calculated to encourage the man who looks both before and behind at the present moment it is the contrast between this Australian federation and the union of England and Ireland. To-day there is no scandal of money employed to corrupt the representatives of the people, nor have the popular wishes been disregarded in the step that has been taken. All parties have advanced towards a common end with a common goodwill, and not a murmur of discontent is heard from the free communities of the South who have merged their independence in the unity of a great Antipodean Empire. What is more striking still is that the policy of federation is not only accompanied by but founded upon a re-assertion of loyalty to the Empire as a whole, and to the Queen as its head, the genuineness of which is not to be disputed. A few years ago cynics might perhaps have questioned the intrinsic value of these demonstrations of goodwill and loyal devotion from our distant colonies. But after the events of the last twelve months even the cynics are reduced to silence. The land which has freely sent so many of its sons to fight and die under the English flag in South Africa can claim that its loyalty is as well attested as that of the Motherland itself. What many men have been asking of late is, what influence the federation of the Australian

colonies is likely to have upon the greater cause of Imperial Federation. The answer to that question is, that whatever else the influence of this step may be, it cannot be an adverse influence. When William Edward Forster was working with characteristic energy and enthusiasm in the cause of Imperial Federation he discussed more than once with a friend the practical results that were likely to be gained during his own lifetime.

I do not believe we shall get any practical results at present; nor do I know that I desire them. The difficulties in the way of a formal scheme of Imperial Federation are so vast and complicated that I confess I cannot at present see how they are all to be overcome. But this I do see, that the federation of the Empire can never take place until the people of the Empire really wish for it; and if I can do anything to raise such a wish in their hearts I shall have accomplished my part of the work.

To-day that portion of the great task is done, and all the peoples of the Empire regard with wistful eyes the vision of Imperial unity. Forster did not live long enough to carry to its completion the portion of the work which he had assigned himself. Others, however, have carried on the task, and to-day the sentiment of Imperial unity watered on many a battlefield has taken root among all the branches of our race who owe allegiance to the Queen.

The month has, in one respect, brought a distinct disappointment to those Englishmen who hope not only for the more complete union of their own Empire, but for a close and cordial relationship between it and the great American Republic. A hundred years ago we had neither forgotten the bitter loss of our American colonies nor learned the lesson which the great calamity should have taught us. This cannot be said to-day, as the events which have attended Lord Hopetoun's arrival at Sydney prove. The desire of Englishmen to stand well with those who 'cut the painter' in 1776 is notorious. It prevails almost universally on this side of the Atlantic, and the fact meets with no less universal recognition on the other side. We had hoped quite recently that we had reached the end of the tail-twisting policy which has so often seemed to American politicians the highest form of practical statesmanship. Events during the war between the United States and Spain were calculated to encourage this belief. Certainly there never was more of social cordiality in the relations of the people of Great Britain and the United States than has prevailed of late. Thursday the 29th of November was Thanksgiving Day in the States, and it was celebrated in this country by a banquet at the Hôtel Cecil, at which the members of the Society of Americans in London took part in their great national celebration. As one of the English guests permitted to be present on the occasion, I can testify to the mutual goodwill of the two branches of the Anglo-Saxon race as testified by the speakers of both countries. Yet in the brief

space of time that has elapsed since that dinner a new cloud has overcast the sky and the political relations of this country and the United States have been more than slightly disturbed. It is extremely difficult for the average Englishman to understand the motives which have induced the Senate of the United States to adopt a course of action regarding the Nicaragua Canal and the treaties affecting it that has at least the appearance of being distinctly hostile to this country. Many credible witnesses in New York and Washington insist that whatever may be the appearances, in reality there is no desire to 'twist the lion's tail,' or to act unfairly towards England on the part of the Senate. If that body insists upon introducing fatal amendments into the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, and if some of its members insist that the time-honoured Clayton-Bulwer treaty is a document which the United States Government can ignore or tear up at its pleasure, it is simply for reasons of domestic policy, and not from want of respect for the rights of the United Kingdom. The argument is ingenious, but it is difficult to see how it can be made to hold water. Treaties between nations are not lightly to be set aside, and they cannot legally be abrogated by one of the parties without the consent of the other. The position of a Government which deliberately ignores its treaty obligations is not a pleasant one—it is certainly not one which the Government of a great State aspiring to a place in the first rank of nations can wish to occupy. The best friends of the United States in this country are filled with uneasiness by the action of the Senate. Even if that action involved no substantial injury to the interests of Great Britain, it would still be a blunder from the point of view of international equity. That this new difficulty in the relations of the two countries should have been caused in the last weeks of the Nineteenth Century is disquieting to those who had hoped that in the new century we should leave behind us the dreary tale of insane jealousies, ridiculous sensitiveness, diplomatic squabbings, and journalistic polemics which so long constituted the story of the relations of this country and the United States. As I write the happiest feature of the situation is the fact that popular passion has not been aroused on either side by the proceedings in the Senate, and that both in London and Washington the desire for a fair and amicable settlement of the problem prevails among those in authority.

A complete Session of Parliament was comprised in the last month of the year. The newly-elected House of Commons met on the 3rd of December, and was prorogued on the 15th. In the seven or eight days upon which debates took place the only practical work accomplished was the voting of a further sum of sixteen millions for the purposes of the war. But apart from the practical work of the short session it was in many ways significant. New members have been writing to the newspapers since the prorogation to express

their disgust at the fact that the House of Commons spent most of its time, not in debating those questions of finance which it had been convened to settle, but in personal discussions of a more or less odious kind. The statement is true enough. The House of Lords is not allowed to vex its Olympian calm with wranglings over money questions; but it is no exaggeration to say that the only debates in the Upper Chamber last month which had the smallest interest for the public were those that touched upon personal issues. The same may be said of the House of Commons. The new members, and with them a not inconsiderable section of the public, naturally demand a reason for the phenomenon that has attracted their attention.

It would be easy to answer that the bitter debates in the House of Commons over questions of persons were merely the result of the after-swell from the fierce storm of the General Election. Yet that answer would be distinctly incorrect. Everybody knows that the election of October was conducted with a bitterness and a freedom of invective which are both rare and extraordinary. The determination of certain of the disputants on the Ministerial side, and notably of the Colonial Secretary, to identify the opponents of the Government with the enemy now waging war upon the Queen's soldiers, naturally aroused a feeling of fierce resentment in the breasts of those Liberals who, whilst remaining Liberals, had taken no part in the agitation by which the Boers were possibly led to believe that public opinion in this country was largely on their side in their quarrel with the English Government. When so flagrant a case of misrepresentation could be adduced as that in which a Liberal candidate who had given two sons to fight under the Queen's colours, one of whom had perished on the field, was described as the ally of Mr. Kruger, nobody could complain if hot words were used to designate the tactics of the Conservative party. But it cannot be said that the most notable feature of the Session was the controversy regarding the manner in which the General Election had been conducted on either side. Even the vexed question of the use made of the letters of Mr. Ellis, Mr. Labouchere, and Dr. Clark, was treated as a matter of comparative insignificance. The House fastened upon two other topics, neither directly connected with the General Election, and debated them with that heat and fervour which seemed so puzzling and discreditable to those M.P.'s who were just beginning their novitiate at St. Stephen's.

The first of these was the manner in which Lord Salisbury after the election had reconstructed his Ministry. It is a subject upon which there was at the time a great deal of comment, not unmingled with rumour. If the truth can be ascertained, it would certainly seem that Lord Salisbury was not fortunate enough to please any section of his followers by the manner in which he re-formed his Ministry. To begin with, the process of reconstruction went much

further than had been anticipated, and as a consequence more than one official who was generally popular with his party in the House of Commons found himself compulsorily retired. Sir Matthew White Ridley, whose happy lot it had been to fill the office of Home Secretary for five years without once raising a storm of popular anger, was put on one side; and his friends could not possibly conceive why. Mr. Chaplin, a special favourite in certain eminent social circles, shared Sir Matthew's fate, and he at least had no hesitation in taking the world into his confidence and permitting it to share in his woes. A certain degree of resentment among the faithful supporters of the Government was inevitable under these circumstances, though it is difficult to see how Lord Salisbury could have brought new members into his Government without making room for them by removing some of his old colleagues. But there were other changes which roused even fiercer anger than the shelving of the Home Secretary and the Secretary to the Local Government Board. The Tory papers, for example, were bitterly incensed by the fact that Lord Lansdowne, having by common consent failed at the War Office, had been given a still higher and more responsible position, that of Minister for Foreign Affairs. Mr. Chamberlain, according to popular rumour, did not regard the treatment accorded to Mr. Powell-Williams, who was retired from his post as Financial Secretary at the War Office, as being justifiable. On the other hand there was a great outcry, among certain faithful Tories who had supported the Ministry without wavering in the old Parliament, at the fact that they were passed over in the redistribution of offices in favour of Liberal Unionists. In short no one was altogether pleased by the results of the painful but necessary process of reconstruction—not even the Prime Minister himself, who, according to the rumour of the day, had not thought of his retirement from the Foreign Office being possible until he found that there were others who thought differently.

It is all as old as the hills, this story of bitterness, disappointment, and heart-burning over the formation or re-formation of a Government. Not a single Ministry of the Nineteenth Century was formed without similar troubles. Mr. Gladstone was wont to declare that the making of the Ministry of 1880 was the easiest task of the kind he had ever had; yet he did not get through his work even then without making the discovery that he had inflicted a mortal wound upon one of his closest friends and oldest colleagues. In this present case, however, the Prime Minister exposed one weak spot in his armour, and it was on that spot that the attention of his critics was concentrated. He was charged with nepotism, inasmuch as he had brought within the precincts of the Cabinet two nephews and a son-in-law, whilst placing his eldest son in the responsible position of Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Those Conservatives who found that, despite the many changes in the reconstructed Ministry, no

room had been found for themselves, were virtuously indignant at the action of the Prime Minister, and Mr. Bartley gave voice to this indignation in a speech which was accentuated rather than depreciated by the ironical criticisms of his fellow-sufferer, Mr. Gibson Bowles. Liberals looked on at this domestic quarrel with a certain degree of amusement. Their sentiments were adequately expressed by Lord Rosebery when he congratulated Lord Salisbury upon being the head of a family possessing an unequalled degree of administrative capacity. Nobody believes that nepotism in its grosser forms is possible to Lord Salisbury; but the general opinion, not merely of his political opponents, but of the world at large, was that he would have acted more prudently if he had displayed a greater regard for the scruples of the squeamish and the later traditions of our official life. The whole situation, as it affected disinterested spectators, was summed up in the exclamation of a Conservative M.P.: 'What would have been said by everybody if Mr. Gladstone had formed a Ministry in this fashion?'

It was upon the head of Mr. Chamberlain, however, that the full fury of the storm of personal criticism burst. Mr. Chamberlain has many remarkable qualities, and they have raised him very high. But his dearest friend will not claim for him the quality of conciliating his opponents. All through his public life it has been the same. Conservative statesmen had likened him to Jack Cade long before it became the fashion among Radicals of a certain school to compare him to a still more notorious and objectionable character. During the General Election he had surpassed himself in the energy with which he had pursued his enemies, the representatives of the Liberal cause in the constituencies. There seemed to be absolutely no limits, either to his vituperative vehemence or his physical activity. He darted here and there throughout the country, making speeches, every one of which contained, not one, but many stings; he wrote letters inspiring those whom he addressed with the belief that unless they did their duty England would find herself at the mercy of a party of traitors; and when the time failed him for letter-writing he despatched telegrams to east and west and north and south, in which he pelted his opponents with insulting epigrams. Never before has such activity on the part of a politician of the front rank been accompanied by so much unrestraint. Mr. Chamberlain was manifestly bent upon surpassing the record of Mr. Gladstone's colossal energy whilst importing his own characteristic methods into the campaign which he was waging with such heroic intensity of purpose. Even those of us who profess no love for the Colonial Secretary were compelled to a certain reluctant admiration by the spectacle which he thus presented.

But he made, or seemed to make, one serious mistake. In one of his telegrams to the supporters of a Conservative candidate in

Lancashire he was represented as saying that a seat lost to the Government was a seat 'sold' to the Boers. Naturally, such a statement aroused the deepest indignation among Liberals who, if they do not claim, as Mr. Chamberlain did, a monopoly of patriotism, are at least conscious that there is no ground for such a calumny as this. The storm spread until it even reached the ears of the Colonial Secretary, who has since frankly admitted that he was too busy during the General Election to observe what was passing around him. He issued a statement to the effect that there had been a telegraphic error in the transmission of the message. He had not used the offensive word 'sold,' but had merely asserted that a seat lost to the Government was 'gained' to the Boers. In ordinary times this would have sufficed to end the incident. But the exasperation of the Liberals against Mr. Chamberlain was so great that they were not to be appeased. Some of their number hardly attempted to conceal their want of belief in the Colonial Secretary's explanation, and during the short Session he was challenged more than once to prove that he had not really used the obnoxious word 'sold.' In the end, but not until after the Session had closed, a facsimile of the original telegram was published, and it was proved conclusively, as sensible people might from the first have anticipated, that Mr. Chamberlain had spoken the simple truth with regard to the wording of the message which, as altered, had caused so much anger.

But in the meantime came the unhappy episode of what has become known as the case of the 'Chamberlain contracts.' Whilst the election was in progress the *Morning Leader*, a Radical news paper, had published a series of statements showing that Mr. Chamberlain and the members of his family were shareholders in a number of Birmingham companies some of which do business with different departments of the Government, and more particularly with the Admiralty and the War Office. Upon these 'revelations' turned one of the most striking debates of the Session. No one ventured to impute anything in the shape of corruption to the Colonial Secretary, but some unpleasant insinuations were undoubtedly made during the course of the debate. Mr. Chamberlain, in defending himself, was able to show that any profit that could accrue to himself from Government contracts was infinitesimal so far as its pecuniary amount was concerned, and the country has accepted his statement as a satisfactory vindication of his personal purity. But here, as in the case of Lord Salisbury, the feeling prevails widely that it would have been well if Mr. Chamberlain had shown greater care in his investments, so as to avoid even the appearance of evil. The *Standard* neatly summed up popular opinion in both cases by stating that 'we could have wished that Lord Salisbury had been able to obtain more talent outside the family circle, and that Mr. Chamberlain had held no shares in any public company to which Government contracts were

given.' Many Conservatives bitterly resent the obtrusion of these personal questions into the discussions of Parliament; but they cannot pretend that there was no provocation for the action of those who raised them. Nor is it possible to acquit the Prime Minister of a somewhat cynical disregard for a wholesome convention. This cynicism was clearly shown in his reply to Lord Rosebery, who raised the question of the appointment of the Earl of Hardwicke as Under-Secretary for India, whilst he remains a member of a firm of stockbrokers. It is not enough that Lord Hardwicke himself is a man of unblemished and unassailable honour. The chief Minister of the Crown, in deciding whether a member of the Stock Exchange is eligible for such an office as that of Under-Secretary for India, is bound to think not so much of the personal merits of an individual as of the consequences of an innovation which in other days and with other men might have far-reaching and unfortunate results. The political history of the last century is on the whole most honourable so far as it throws light upon the characters of our public men, but even that history, singularly creditable as it is, should have satisfied Lord Salisbury that scandals have occurred and may occur again. All party feeling apart, it is impossible not to feel that the standard of public morality, so far as it affects politicians of the official class, has not been maintained as it should have been by the present Prime Minister.

The vote of sixteen millions to meet the current expenses of the war was the only practical work of the Session. Ministers asked for the money in a chastened mood, and one of their number offered the House a frank official confession of the miscalculations which they had made in their estimates of the cost and gravity of the operations against the Boers. A more remarkable series of miscalculations can hardly be found in the records of the past century. An initial blunder would have been explicable, and might readily have been excused. But for eighteen months past Ministers have stumbled from one blunder into another owing to an optimism for which there has been no justification, and which, singularly enough, has not been shared by the intelligent portion of the public. Their last and in some respect, their greatest miscalculation was when they precipitated the General Election on the assumption that the war was practically at an end, and that it would receive the *coup de grâce* when the Boers became aware that the Government had secured a new vote of confidence from the country. The General Election is a thing of the past, and the war is still with us. Last Christmas, when the nation was passing through the bitterest crisis of the century with a silent fortitude that may not improperly be described as sublime, none of us could have believed that the Yuletide of 1900 would witness such a state of things as that which now confronts us in South Africa. The guerilla warfare,

which began after the flight of Mr. Kruger from the country he had ruined, has proved to be more serious than any of us anticipated. In Commander De Wet the Boers have discovered a general of the highest capacity, who seems able to escape from the most perilous positions with an ease and certainty that recall the numberless evasions accomplished at the other end of Africa by our old enemy Osman Digna. To and fro throughout the vast territory that we have now annexed he has moved, apparently at his own pleasure: raiding here, tearing up the lines of railway there, capturing a transport train in one direction, and a military contingent in another. Nor has he been the mere guerilla, trusting solely to his swiftness of movement for his power of escaping us. He has shown that he can fight, and fight well; and though in almost every regular encounter we have come off victorious, it has been at a cost that has darkened too many British homes.

It would be idle now to discuss the causes of the new phase upon which the struggle has entered. Some critics find the reason in the mildness of the treatment accorded by Lord Roberts to the population of the annexed territory; others blame him for having insisted upon 'unconditional' surrender when he was in communication with Botha and De Wet after the collapse of the regular Boer Government. For the present these discussions are beside the question. The melancholy fact we have to confront, as the year draws to a close, is that our troops are still engaged, in a costly and painful struggle with a foe which, if gradually drawing nearer to the point of exhaustion, is certainly not yet beaten; and that this foe during the last fortnight of December has not merely been able to capture considerable bodies of British troops but to invade Cape Colony itself and revive the fires of sedition among the Queen's subjects there. To meet this dangerous situation we are sending further reinforcements to Capetown, and, at a cost which makes the military expert shudder, are adding to the force of cavalry in South Africa the few squadrons we had retained in this country during the height of the war.

The man in the street and the writers in the ministerial newspapers still preserve an appearance of confidence, almost, indeed, of self-satisfaction, in presence of these events. But it has been manifest of late that Ministers are no longer in the optimistic mood. Lord Salisbury's recent speeches have been couched in a tone of depression that has startled his admirers, and other Ministerial utterances have been in the same key. Some have concluded from this fact that the Government is in possession of exclusive news from South Africa of the most unfavourable kind, news so bad that it dare not give it to the public. This is an absurd idea. It is true that Lord Kitchener, upon whom the chief command of our forces has devolved, maintains the chill reticence which distinguished him during the Soudan expedition, and that there are few

correspondents left in the field to supply the deficiencies in the official despatches. But every week brings us not only thousands of letters from the front, but men of intelligence and experience who have actually seen what is passing there. No Ministry in these circumstances could hide the truth, even if it desired to do so, and this Ministry has not laid itself open to the charge of seeking to conceal our misfortunes from us. The depression which has undoubtedly fallen upon those who are behind the scenes may be ascribed to the disappointment of the hopes which they formed after the occupation of Pretoria, and to the uniformly gloomy stories which are brought back from the field by the officers and civilians who have recently returned from South Africa to England. It is too soon to dwell upon the tales that come from the actual scene of operations; but it may be said at once that the miscalculations which have been made at home have had their counterpart in South Africa. The splendid valour of our men and the self-sacrificing heroism of our officers are as great as ever; but the task laid upon them has increased in difficulty as time has passed, and, though the end of the long struggle is now confidently anticipated in the early spring, it is too soon for those who know the truth to regard the situation with the complacent self-satisfaction of the ignorant. The unmistakable hint conveyed to the nation when the thanksgiving service which was arranged for the day on which Lord Roberts returned to London was abandoned can neither be ignored nor misunderstood.

But if the month has brought us depression and even misfortune at the seat of war, it has seen an unexpected improvement in our fortunes in another quarter. At the close of November ex-President Kruger was still in Paris, where he was the object of demonstrations of popular enthusiasm to which few parallels are to be found. He was, in fact, floating on a tide of public favour that still seemed to be rising, and that conceivably might have swept before it all the restraining influences of diplomacy and statecraft. Even the French Ministry, in spite of its desire to create no fresh cause of irritation between France and this country, was compelled to temporise with the popular passion; and there were signs that the dangerous excitement was spreading over the Continent. It was at this moment that, owing to two specific causes, the whole situation was changed, and the gravest perils averted not merely from Great Britain but from Europe. One of these causes was the fatal blunder committed by Mr. Kruger and his adviser Mr. Leyds when they thought that with popular feeling in their favour they could force the hand of the German Emperor, and the other was the foresight and resolution of that remarkable man himself. His refusal to receive Mr. Kruger, equivalent to a prohibition of the latter's proposed visit to Berlin, was, as he has declared through the mouth of his Chancellor, inspired solely by his sense of what the interests of

his own country required; but this fact did not make his act less courageous or less favourable to the cause of peace. Compelled to retreat upon Holland the ex-President has since had the bitter mortification of learning that all hope of European intervention in his favour is at an end. Already, although he makes spasmodic appearances in public, the fickle populace seems to be paying less and less attention to his movements, and he appears to be left to such consolations as he can receive from those who think that arbitration can be invoked after defeat, even when the defeated belligerent has in the first instance refused it, and those others—including a certain number of the Queen's subjects—who cling tenaciously to the belief that in the whole of the events which have culminated in the tragedy of the war Mr. Kruger has been in the right and England in the wrong.

The fact that there are persons amongst us who not only hold this view but maintain it with energy and courage leads to the last topic raised by the events of the past month, the relations of parties and the state of the Opposition. It is not altogether an agreeable topic for a Liberal. I have spoken of the way in which during the general election the electors were asked to believe that the Liberal party was in alliance with the enemies of the country. So far as the overwhelming majority of Liberals were concerned, no greater calumny could have been uttered, and it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the very men who spread it were aware that it was false. But even those of us who resent most bitterly this imputation upon our loyalty and good faith must admit that the members of a certain small section of the extreme left of our party not only justified Tory electioneers in bringing this charge against them but ostentatiously proclaimed that it was true. To some of us it seems that there is little to choose between the rabid, howling jingo, who was seen at his worst when the war first broke out, and the fanatical pro-Boer who has honestly come to believe that everything that his own country does must be wrong. But there is no doubt as to which of the two extremes is viewed with the greater disfavour by the public at large. The 'bias of anti-patriotism' is neither a desirable nor a creditable thing at any time. It naturally becomes hateful to the whole community when it manifests itself in attacks upon our soldiers in a war that has stirred the nation to its depths. Even if the censors of their own race do no more than make use of the inevitable horrors and miseries of the battle-field in order to arouse feeling against their fellow-countrymen, they play a part the reverse of noble; but when, not content with this, they repeat without due care or full enquiry the loose stories that are always current at times like the present, and repeat them for the direct purpose of discrediting our soldiers, and others who are risking their lives in our service, they sink to a depth of discredit that can hardly be fathomed.

No excuse, not even that of a fanatical and one-sided devotion to what they believe to be the cause of justice, can be pleaded for them. The common instinct of human nature leads us to visit them with an unsparing condemnation. The Liberal party unfortunately for itself has had to bear the obloquy of association with some who have been guilty of this grave offence. One cannot wonder that it has suffered in consequence. But what one does wonder at is the fact that this mere handful of men, full of zeal for what they believe to be truth and justice, but unhappily blinded by the passion of fanaticism, should be allowed to pose as though they represented not a mere fraction but the majority of our party. When the short Session began there were signs that a distinct improvement in the position of the Opposition was at hand, and wise Conservatives were at one with most Liberals in desiring that this improvement should take place. The wish to see Lord Rosebery return to his natural place in the party of which he had been the leader prevailed almost universally. Lord Rosebery himself without taking any formal step acted in the House of Lords, as *the Times* remarked, like a man who not only has been the leader of a party, but may be again. Everything seemed to be advancing towards the desired solution of a difficult situation. But suddenly the hopes of the friends of Liberalism met with a check. How far it may be true that a desperate intrigue was woven by those who desire any alternative—even the permanent ruin of the Liberal party—rather than the return of Lord Rosebery to the leadership, I do not pretend to say. But at any rate it is certain that the men with whom Lord Rosebery has notoriously no sympathy, the men animated by ‘the bias of anti-patriotism,’ pushed themselves to the front in the House of Commons and spoke as though they were the true and only accredited representatives of Liberalism. If their pretensions had been well founded, it would no longer have been possible for any Liberal to denounce the slanders which were used by his opponents at the general election. Everybody knows that this is not the case. The majority of Liberals love their country, and, whatever errors particular Ministers may have committed, long for the end of the struggle in South Africa by the triumph of British arms, being assured that in such a triumph may be found the best hopes for the future happiness alike of the colonies and of the Empire as a whole. These men cannot understand why it was left to the extreme faction to play their dismal part as the slanderers of English soldiers and officers and the avowed partisans of England’s enemies, without opposition or repudiation from those who could have spoken with authority as the exponents of the opinion of the majority of their party. It is chiefly owing to this strange inaction that the closing month of the century has found the Liberal party hardly more happily placed than it was a hundred years ago.

WEMYSS REID.

CURRENT POLITICS

II

A CONSERVATIVE VIEW

THE most striking feature of the short autumn Session of Parliament was the revelation that Her Majesty's Opposition is in a state of collapse. For the present there is no alternative Cabinet to that of Lord Salisbury. The minority has abdicated its constitutional function. It is not merely the business of an Opposition to oppose. Practically, though not theoretically, the party out of office exists in order that it may come into power when occasion requires. It is the real substitute, or should be, for the various 'checks and balances' on the uncontrolled action of the Executive, which the constitution is supposed to provide, but which are now mostly in abeyance. In the interval between two General Elections there is scarcely anything to prevent a Government, with a strong majority in both Houses of Parliament, from doing, within limits, pretty much what it pleases, unless it has the fear of the Opposition before its eyes. Even the salutary apprehension that it may offend public opinion, and so be beaten when it comes to the polls, is based upon this consideration. To turn out one Ministry means to put in another. But if there is no combination of leading politicians, able or willing to take over the administration, that process cannot be adopted. The Sovereign and the Nation are alike denied their proper and legitimate remedy for what they may regard as the mismanagement of their affairs. It is useless to dispense with one body of officials if it is not possible to replace them, except by those who are practically committed to their own policy, and have, in fact, been sedulously engaged in supporting it. In such circumstances, instead of that healthy change of men and measures, which sends a vivifying breeze through national administration, and is one of the compensating advantages of our party system, we get nothing but a mere shuffling of the cards and a shifting of the *personnel*; or at the best we can only have a reconstruction, more or less judicious, of the dominant members of the dominant group, all of whom have been working in close association for years. The nation may really be

dissatisfied with its rulers, but it has no means of carrying its convictions into effect unless there is an available Opposition Cabinet. At present it is obvious that this is not the case. Let us assume for a moment that a whole series of disasters in South Africa, or the exhibition of gross incompetency at headquarters, had convinced the country that Lord Salisbury and his colleagues could no longer be safely entrusted with the conduct of the war. Yet how could either the elector, if the question should come before him, or the private member of Parliament, decide to vote for their dismissal? He would naturally say, 'If I do my best to overthrow the Conservative Cabinet, what do I intend to substitute for it? Am I voting for Sir William Harcourt, who opposes the War, or Sir Henry Fowler, who supports it, or Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who sometimes approves and sometimes opposes and sometimes does both? Is there any likelihood that a combination made up of the genuine admirers, reluctant allies, and candid friends, of these various gentlemen, could do the nation's business satisfactorily at a very critical period?' After all, the Queen's Government must be carried on; and even a Cabinet which has made mistakes is better than none at all, or than one which would only be formed to go to pieces. Indeed it is tolerably certain that if, through any cause, Lord Salisbury's Cabinet were to be expelled from office, its place could not be assumed by a Ministry officially representing the Liberal parties as they appear at present in the House of Commons and the country. There would be nothing for it but to constitute another Conservative Cabinet, with perhaps the addition of one or two Liberal Imperialists, who might abandon a meaningless name, and a party connection that only makes them uncomfortable.

To judge by the utterances of the special organs of this group of the composite Opposition, the Imperialist Liberals are under the impression that they have shown a peculiar and exceptional patriotism during the present conjuncture of affairs. They seem to think that it is rather a fine thing to agree with the Government and to act—ineffectually—with its opponents: to believe that Ministers are in the main right, and to associate themselves with those who consider them wholly wrong. It is difficult to see why there is to admire in this curious conduct, or why politicians like Lord Rosebery, Sir Edward Grey, and Mr. Asquith should maintain their alliance with those whose views, on the most pressing set of questions before the country, they must contemplate with abhorrence. They apparently console themselves for the aberrations of their allies by reflecting that on certain subjects, now latent or dormant, they might be in sympathy with them. It must be an odd process of reasoning which could induce Sir Henry Fowler, for example, who is a rather more perfervid jingo than most Tories, to condone the offences of Mr. Bryn Roberts and Mr. Keir Hardie against

Imperialism, because perchance he might possibly accept their ideas on the Taxation of Ground Values and the Enfranchisement of Leaseholds. Domestic legislation of this kind is off the stage, and will so remain till our present international and military difficulties are disposed of. When we have leisure for reform again, there are other topics which will claim attention, and on them the Liberal Right is just as likely to agree with the Conservatives as with its own Celtic and Radical Left. Everything that is practical, immediate, and important, should bind the Liberal Imperialists to the followers of the Government; their ties with the older Liberals are vague, remote, and speculative. To an outsider it would seem that there is nothing to boast of in this preference for names over facts, and in a misplaced fidelity to a party tradition. The divergence between the two sections, not merely on the particular issue in South Africa, but on the whole system of doctrines which is known as Imperialism, is fundamental. It will not pass away when the Boer War is concluded, as optimists like Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and the *Westminster Gazette* imagine; for it is based on irreconcilable theories of life, conduct, the duties of a State, and the limits of public, and even private, morality. By attempting to act together, the two wings only doom each other to impotence. The one is all the time eager to advance while the other is anxious to hang back. The result is seen in the singularly ineffective and unreal indictments of the Government in the debates on the Address and the Vote of Credit. No one can deny that some of the speeches made by individual members of the Opposition were extremely able. Sir William Harcourt, Sir Robert Reid and Mr. Bryce delivered attacks on the ministerial policy which, read by themselves, look very damaging. Yet damage they did none at all, nor was it possible they should. For before the bow was bent the barb had been drawn from the arrow. The assailants of the Cabinet knew very well that a powerful contingent of its defenders were laagered within their own lines.

It is a situation which cannot long endure, nor does it seem desirable that it should do so. We need two parties for the proper working of our constitutional machinery—two parties homogeneous and with strongly defined principles. It is of no benefit to the nation that half the occupants of the Liberal benches should be Conservatives in all essentials but the name; nor is the arrangement advantageous to the Tories or even to the Liberals themselves. As for the last-named disturbed 'congeries of atoms,' it would gain by sacrificing numbers to cohesion. The defection of the Imperialists would leave it numerically very weak in the House of Commons. But it would obtain unity, and internal peace, and, above all, it would have acquired a definite ground of antagonism to the ruling majority. It would form a nucleus around which Liberalism, if ever again it is to become formidable in the constituencies, might gather. And it would offer

the Liberal elector a distinct and intelligible reason why he should continue to vote for his own side rather than for the other. At present he has no such clear motive for action; and except for the attachment to an honoured name, and the influence of habit, and of individual predilections in some cases, one does not see why Walsall or Wolverhampton electors should have cast their suffrages for the one kind of Imperialist rather than the other. Moreover, though the Opposition would have been beaten in the House of Commons in any case, they would have made a very different fight, if their champions had felt that the assault on the Government was meant to be pressed home, instead of knowing that it was a mere demonstration, always in danger of being checked by a movement from their own flanks. As it is constituted at present, Her Majesty's Opposition is practically a negligible quantity. The same situation has arisen several times in the course of the present and last century, and it has always tended to the disorganisation of Parliament and the detriment of our public life.

Some time before a South African war had appeared on the horizon, it was pointed out in this Review that there was no serious question of principle to divide the moderate men of both parties, and that there were no reasons, except those of a personal nature, to prevent Lord Rosebery and others, who now call themselves Liberal Imperialists, from openly joining the Conservatives. Since then their differences with the Radicals have been forced to the surface by the War, and the suggested separation and reunion seem more than ever justifiable. The position of the Roseberyites is analogous to that of the Liberal Unionists after the promulgation of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme in 1886. But Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Goschen and their followers, though for a time they continued to sit on the left of the Speaker's chair, no longer professed to act with the Gladstonians. If the Liberal Imperialists followed this precedent, they would at least have the satisfaction of openly striving for the success of the party, whose defeat, by their own nominal allies, they would regard as a national calamity.

When political controversies do not turn on principles of policy, they naturally descend to personalities. If measures cannot be discussed, it is always possible to fall upon men. It has been noticed, and sometimes commented upon as a proof of the growing degeneration of our public life, that personal attacks have played an intolerable part in the polemics of the last few months. The furious vituperation of certain ministers and officials, begun in the Recess, was carried on during the elections and continued through the Session. The Opposition campaign was largely a series of onslaughts upon Mr. Chamberlain, in his private as well as his ministerial capacity. Occasionally the fire was diverted to Lord Salisbury. But this concentration of attention upon personal topics, sometimes

rather important, often trivial, was not mainly due to Radical malice. It arose out of unfortunate and unsympathetic association of dissonant elements. The sole real bond of union among the Opposition groups, their chief claim to public confidence, is their pretension that, as individuals, they are better men and would make better Ministers than the present holders of office. One reason for demanding a broad and intelligible difference of doctrine between the parties is that without it the contest for power becomes a mere contest for 'the spoils.' Why should one set of Ministers be turned out to make room for others who do not profess that they would seriously modify the policy of their predecessors? The only reason must be that the new lot are more capable, more high-minded, more honourable, than those whom they endeavour to displace. And as it is disagreeable to vaunt one's own virtues, the proposition must be established by disparaging the capacity, and, where possible, the honesty of the rival statesmen. Apart from this, there was the temptation of finding topics on which, 'without prejudice,' the Opposition could pull together. Sir Edward Grey disagrees on most subjects with Mr. John Burns, as no doubt Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman does with Mr. Labouchere, and the *Daily News* with the *Manchester Guardian*; but all could unite in 'going for' Mr. Chamberlain over his shares and his telegrams. The process was easier since the Colonial Secretary was undoubtedly vulnerable. Many Conservatives must have regretted that he did not sever his family connection with Kynoch's and 'Tubes, Limited,' and other companies which had large contracts with the Government. They know very well that the honourable traditions of English politics would have been better maintained if he had done so; they may admit that, in retaining his shares in a company which was alleged to have used his name on their advertising circulars, he acted with some want of delicacy and discretion. They may recognise also that the famous telegram, which was 'crystallised out of the comparatively innocent dictum of the Mayor of Mafeking, carried electioneering licence somewhat further than is desirable. But what an exaggerated fuss was made about it all! The country is in the throes of great war. Round it are the meshes of an international situation that grows in complexity every month. It is faced by the necessity of a military reorganisation on the largest scale, which must involve problems of a wholly different character from any we have yet had to solve. It has to reckon with new burdens in South Africa, with the task of holding down by force, perhaps 'for generations,' as Lord Salisbury has told us, a population of white and European origin. Yet all these grave matters hardly arouse so much interest with all sections of the Opposition as the private financial affairs of a Minister, who, in any case, is a wealthy man and quite above the suspicion of personal corruption. Nor can

the Liberals be said to have managed their case with any skill. Mr. Chamberlain's *faux pas*, such as it was, in sending the Bury telegram was not enough for them. They would not be content with his statement that the words 'sold to' the Boers were an error not of his making. The reiterated expression of doubt on this point, the challenges to produce the copy of the despatch, meant, if they meant anything, that Mr. Chamberlain was deliberately lying to the House of Commons. The production of the original telegram disposed of the insinuation, and the chief impression left on the mind of the country was one of ineffectual Radical malice. But that is what a party is reduced to when it is compelled by unhappy necessity to substitute personalities for principles.

Points of more importance were raised in Lord Rosebery's criticism of the appointment of Lord Hardwicke as Under-Secretary of State for India. Lord Rosebery's own zeal for administrative purity is undoubted; but the question is not to be settled in the somewhat perfunctory fashion in which it was stated by him in the House of Lords and hastily echoed in the Press. It sounds well enough to say that no Minister should be connected with a firm of stockbrokers, or should be a director of a public company. But the first proposition evidently implies, as Lord Hardwicke observed in his reply to his critic, that a stockbroker is necessarily a speculator. That is precisely what he is not supposed to be. He is ostensibly no more than the agent of other persons who buy and sell stocks and shares; and unless there is something specially dishonourable about his business, which nobody maintains, there seems no more reason why he should be disqualified from public functions than if he were an agent for the purchase and sale, not of securities but of cotton, or corn, or indigo. It is true that some stockbrokers do, directly or indirectly, engage in speculation, and for that purpose the 'inside' knowledge a Minister may obtain would often be valuable. But the same consideration would apply to other Ministers who are not connected with 'the City.' Anybody who has early and exclusive information may, if he be so inclined, use it for the purpose of making money on the Stock Exchange. The only guarantee we have that Ministers, whatever their profession, will not so abuse their privileges is the fact that they are, as a rule, honourable men. As to the directors of public companies, of whom a good deal has been said lately, it is even more necessary to act with caution. Lord Salisbury's remarks on this subject in the House of Lords, on the 14th of December, were full of that shrewd judgment which he so often exhibits in dealing with anything that looks like popular cant; and it must be remembered that he himself has been connected with the management of great business corporations, and knows very well what he is talking about. People, he said, have set up 'a sort of clap-trap cry' against directors, though as a class

they are in no degree more guilty of commercial sin than any other members of the mercantile community. There are dishonest directors, and there are directors whose companies are closely connected with departments of State. 'But that does not give any license generally to attack all directors; nor does the fact that stockbrokers conduct their business in a place where much speculation occurs give you a right to brand them as having naturally inherited such dishonesty that no one who is a stockbroker may be a servant of the Queen.' The danger is that these distinctions and proscriptions may unduly limit the area from which members of the Government can be chosen. The field of selection is already restricted by the constitutional custom that each of the public departments shall have a representative in each Chamber of Parliament, a Secretary of State in the Commons and an Under-Secretary in the Lords, or *vice versa*. If a close connection with mercantile or joint-stock enterprise is to be regarded as disqualification, the difficulty of finding suitable men for these high places is considerably increased. That is not exactly the way to secure that efficient conduct of national affairs, the lack of which we so often have to deplore. 'Remember,' said Lord Salisbury, 'that the difficulty in our administration and the difficulty in Parliament is not that, on the whole, people know too much about business, but that they know too little, that they belong generally to classes of society not brought into contact with business.' It is certainly rather curious that in the course of a few days the Prime Minister should have been attacked, first for appointing to ministerial posts too many of his own relatives, and secondly for going to the Stock Exchange for an under-secretary. But if the young aristocrats personally known to the makers of Cabinets must be excluded, as well as the directors and the stockbrokers, the task of obtaining the proper complement to form an Administration will not be easy. The whole controversy illustrates the peculiar conditions under which our Governments are constituted. There may be plenty of capable men outside the narrow circle in which party-leaders move. But a Premier does not easily get at them. He cannot ask 'the man in the street' to advise him on the choice of his colleagues.

These considerations give us additional reason to regret the refusal of Lord Rosebery and his Imperialist colleagues to take the bold and logical step of openly joining the Unionist parties. No candid Conservative is quite satisfied with the *personnel* of the present Government. It is not exactly a Ministry of All the Talents, and the abnormal size of the Cabinet serves to emphasise rather than conceal its numerous weak places. The available material at Lord Salisbury's disposal is not too abundant or of the best quality; and several of the present heads of departments are, like the Prime Minister himself, long past middle-age, and in the course of the

next few years must be expected to join Lord Goschen, Lord Ridley, and Mr. Chaplin, in retirement. The accession of Lord Rosebery, of Sir Edward Grey, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Haldane, and other active and comparatively youthful politicians, to the Unionist ranks, would give a fresh reserve of statesmanlike ability and administrative energy to draw upon. The departure of this contingent from the camp in which they are now unwilling and unwelcome guests would leave the Opposition smaller, it is true, for the time, but far more effective and united; while it would provide a body of capable men with something more worthy of their powers than the petty and inadequate criticism, the feeble carping over minor personalities, in which they occupied themselves during the late Session. Even if the Roseberyttes imitated the Liberal Unionists in 1886, and for a time declined to enter the Government or to lose their identity, there would be abundant opportunities for useful service in independent alliance with the Unionists. They could assist in that stiffening of administration, that reconcentration of national life, which is the first of our necessities. The century has closed in a wave of self-examination, perhaps even of self-reproach, novel and unfamiliar to the complacent Anglo-Saxon temper. The South African War has precipitated ideas which have been vaguely floating through our consciousness for some time past. We have begun to entertain doubts as to our efficiency in practical matters, and our capacity for organising victory, not merely in war but also in peace. The exaltation of the Jubilee Year remains, but it is accompanied by a deeper sense of Imperial and national responsibility, and a suspicion that the triumphs of our past will not be repeated or maintained unless we alter our methods. Alike in our private and our public business we show some want of the scientific accuracy, the careful adaptation of means to ends, the skilled training, and the well-directed industry, that are necessary to success in the struggle by which we are menaced in the Twentieth Century. No one has better translated into words this sentiment, at once of pride and of anxiety, of determination and disquietude, than Lord Rosebery himself. His Rectorial Address at Glasgow University, now republished, was a most sagacious dissertation on the obligations of Empire, and on the impossibility of retaining our commanding political and commercial position without study, knowledge, and systematic effort.

It is impossible to read the splendid periods with which this Address closed without a thrill of patriotic emotion; and the magnificent burst of rhetorical eloquence is none the less effective because it is preceded by the sober admonition to organise, to educate, and to work. But one cannot help suggesting that something else is needed besides soul-stirring phrases or even judicious lectures on our acknowledged shortcomings. So far as practical legislation and improved administration are concerned we are 'no forrarder.' Nor shall we

make any progress until persons like Lord Rosebery himself do not confine themselves to advice and exhortation, but think out the stages of reform, and use legitimate means to get them initiated. The national character may or may not be improved by sermons from the platform and the press. But to put right the definite faults in our institutions, in the management of our public offices, in our military organisation, in our educational system, in our supervision and regulation of commerce and industry—these are matters for the Statesman and the Parliamentarian. Here is a subject for the Liberal Imperialists, if they would join the Progressive Conservatives in bringing pressure to bear upon the Government in the interests of national reconstruction and administrative reform. From the Cabinet itself, without such pressure, little can be expected. For many months, perhaps for years to come, they will be occupied in quenching the flames of war in South Africa and restoring order and settled government in that distracted region. Yet Great Britain cannot wait while the Transvaal is being pacified. Conservative reformers will need all the strength they can obtain to get anything done, beyond those bare necessities of the hour in which Ministers are naturally absorbed. Backed by the Imperialist Liberals they might do much. And the latter could find a task into which they could put their heart, as well as their words.

The sincerity of those who have been preaching to the nation on the texts mentioned may be tested before long. On no point is there more general agreement than on the deficiencies of our technical and secondary education. If the American and the German manufacturers are passing us in the foreign markets, or even in our own, it is chiefly because their masters and their men are better instructed, especially the men. On this point, one need only cite the testimony of any expert who has recently considered the facts. There is no better witness than Mr. Birchenough, whose admirable essay in the last number of this Review was based upon an examination of many great manufacturing establishments on the continent of Europe:—

It is only [he says] since other countries have begun to educate and train their people upon carefully thought-out scientific principles that their rivalry has begun to turn to our disadvantage. Just as undisciplined courage proves in the long run of no avail against disciplined forces in the field, so in industrial warfare, I fear, untutored natural gifts must eventually succumb to the superiority of careful professional training. Education is becoming for us a question of vital and imperial importance. ●

Mr. Birchenough states that a leading Berlin banker, with whom he discussed the question of British industry and foreign competition, put his finger upon our weak place without hesitation. 'You are,' he said, 'the first people in the world with your great Empire, and your great trade, your wonderful administrative gifts, and your inexhaustible

enterprise; but your danger lies in the want of education of your people. If you can overcome that, in my opinion, you have nothing to fear.' It would be easy to multiply evidence to the same effect. All those who are bidding us furbish our weapons for the industrial conflict are agreed that better education, particularly of the technical and scientific kind, is what we most need. But in this last month a damaging, almost a deadly, blow has been dealt at such popular secondary instruction as we possess. Slowly, and under many difficulties, the School Boards, with the aid of the Science and Art Department, and the rather languid encouragement of Whitehall, have built up a system of improved education for the young men and women of the great towns. Evening Schools, Continuation Schools, Science and Art classes, have been established; and it is possible in many places for the ambitious young artisan or clerk to learn mechanics, chemistry, shorthand, commercial arithmetic, book-keeping, and various other subjects which are taught in the communal or State schools of Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, and Denmark. The judgment in the case of *'The Queen v. Cockerton'* sweeps away all this progress at a stroke. Mr. Justice Wills and Mr. Justice Kennedy have decided that School Boards may only dispense 'elementary' education; that physics, drawing, history, French and German are not elementary; that the teaching in the Science and Art classes is not authorised by the Statutes and must not be paid for out of the rates or the education grant; and that only children may be taught out of the School Board funds whether in day or in evening classes. The decision may be upset on appeal; but there is no reason to suppose that the two learned judges of the Queen's Bench have not correctly followed the letter, and even the spirit, of the Act of 1870. The legislators of that year doubtless intended to institute little more than rate-aided and State-aided Ragged Schools: establishments where the children of very poor people could just contrive to pick up spelling, and writing, and simple arithmetic. But in the intervening years different and higher conceptions of the meaning of national education have gained currency. The various authorities have combined to place some adequate opportunities within the reach of the industrial classes. The practical defeat of the efforts of the School Managers, the Science and Art Department, and the Board of Education, to encourage higher-grade Board schools, is a national disaster. New legislation is imperatively required, either to authorise the expenditure which the Court of Queen's Bench has declared to be illegal on the part of the School Boards, or to establish secondary public schools in some other way. Otherwise, with all our talk of education, and with all the exhortations of eminent persons to thoroughness, alertness and the like, we shall enter upon the new century worse equipped than we were a decade ago. I venture to suggest that politicians who are at once Imperialists and Reformers

should take up this question and not suffer it to sleep till it is effectually disposed of. We cannot, for the reasons just stated, expect much from a Government, harassed to find the men, the money and the means to conquer first and pacify afterwards the States and Colonies of South Africa; we can hardly suppose that the Radicals will spare time to turn from the iniquities of Mr. Chamberlain to see that young workmen and shop-assistants are induced to spend their evenings at a drawing-class instead of a public-house. But moderate and progressive men of the two parties must take care that this really ruinous step backward is speedily atoned for by the Legislature. To equip our artisans to hold their own in the fierce rivalry with which they are threatened from abroad must be one prominent item in the policy of constructive Conservatism. Imperialists of either confession should be forward in the work. It is likely to be of more genuine value than many eloquent speeches on the dignity and splendour of the British Empire.

• The international horizon, though still overcast, has cleared a good deal during the last few weeks. It may not be entirely satisfactory to our feelings to find that Mr. Kruger occupies a position in the popular imagination on the Continent such as men like Garibaldi and Kossuth held in this country. But it is some consolation to know that, though the crowds may cheer and the newspapers rave, the governments will do nothing. If any hope remained to Mr. Kruger, after the polite negative tendered to him at the Quai d'Orsay, it must have been destroyed by the German Emperor's refusal to see him, followed by the extraordinarily candid statements of Count von Bülow in the Reichstag. The German Chancellor declared the policy of Germany with a quite Bismarckian plainness. His two very able and statesman-like speeches were not animated by effusive friendliness towards this country, perhaps because, in the present state of popular feeling among the Germans, any extravagant professions of amity would be misunderstood or resented. But the substance more than compensates for any lack of cordiality in expression. Count von Bülow made it perfectly clear that Germany is supremely conscious of the fact that France has not yet forgiven her, and that she cannot afford to quarrel with England while she has a watchful, armed rival on her Western frontier. Whether the significant references to the events of the Jameson Raid, and the possibility of an Anglo-French alliance against Germany, were intended as a warning to France or an invitation, may be matter for conjecture. At any rate, it is enough for us to know that no Power will disturb us in our work in South Africa. In that region itself the occurrences of December, the 'reverse' at Nooitgedacht, the dash of De Wet through our lines at Thabanehu, and the raids into Cape Colony, have made matters look worse than they did three months ago. It is fortunate that the grim business of wearing

down the resistance of the toughest enemies we have had to encounter for a century will not be complicated by interference from outside. Even so, we shall use up a good many troops before we get the guerilla war under, and we shall need a large permanent force to keep the smouldering embers from flaming up again.

Our absorption in the melancholy South African *imbroglio* may perhaps account for our comparative indifference towards other important events abroad. The final agreement of the Powers on the joint demands which are to be presented to the Chinese Government has passed almost unnoticed. There was a time when a tempest would have raged in England over the virtual repudiation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty by the United States Senate. As it is, we take it very calmly indeed, and there is scarcely an echo of the excitement which the action of the Senate has aroused in America. Yet the maintenance of an open and neutral waterway between the two Oceans is not exactly a question to be ignored by those who are responsible for the destinies of Canada, Jamaica, and Australasia. To gratuitously abandon all our rights in regard to the Central American Isthmus—rights for which we have steadily contended for two generations, and for which we more than once almost risked a quarrel with the United States—is hardly to be contemplated. But Englishmen—or that minority of them who give any attention to the matter—decline to be alarmed, for several reasons. In the first place, they decline to take the jingoism of the United States Senate seriously. They believe that it is partly a mere demonstration, and partly engineered by the railway interests, which do not want an ‘American Canal’ or any Canal at all, and are only anxious to get the Hay-Pauncefote treaty rejected, and the Construction Bill burked. Nothing, indeed, would embarrass certain influential parties in the United States more than the acceptance by England of the ratified and amended Treaty. This, however, is not likely to happen. If the arrangement negotiated in the spring falls to the ground, we have still the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and Englishmen do not for a moment believe that the American Government would imitate the Senators and ‘denounce’ it. They are satisfied that, if it is given up, it will be as the result of a bargain, by which adequate compensation for the surrender will be obtained by Great Britain, either in the Western hemisphere or elsewhere. They remember that the abrogation of the Treaty of 1850 would not be so much pure gain to the United States. Great Britain would also be released from her self-denying ordinance in reference to Central America, and would be entitled to negotiate for the acquisition or retrocession of those naval bases and coaling-stations which she claimed or coveted fifty years ago. On the whole the feeling on the subject is optimistic; though whether the optimism is really justified by the facts, or is only prompted by our earnest desire not to acknowledge the existence of further international complications, I should not like to say.

SIDNEY LOW.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF INDULGENCES

THE Catholic doctrine of Indulgences seems to be one of those puzzles which no efforts at explanation on the part of Catholics can succeed in making clear to certain non-Catholic minds. The reason, no doubt, is partly this—that the word ‘indulgence’ is in England a marked and branded word, especially when it occurs in connection with sin. I remember being once engaged in a mild newspaper controversy with a venerable dignitary of the Establishment who wanted to fasten upon me the immorality of ‘indulgences’ by quoting what Gloucester flings in the face of the Bishop of Winchester in *Henry the Sixth, First Part*, Act i. sc. 3. I had to point out to him that the ecclesiastical meaning of the word ‘indulgentia’ was by no means identical with the literary force of the term ‘indulgence.’ Whatever may have been the primitive source of the Latin word, the Canon Law has adopted it from that post-classical period in which it came to signify ‘remission,’ as of punishment or taxation. In this sense it is used, for example, in the Theodosian Code to designate the law of clemency by which, every five or every ten years, lesser criminals had their punishment remitted. It bears a similar sense in the Capitularies of Charles the Bald, where it occurs more than once. This was the meaning it came to bear in the Canon Law—‘*remissio poenae*.’¹ It is therefore very inadequately expressed by our modern word ‘indulgence.’ The old English ‘pardon’ is better; it does not, at least, suggest that the Church is allowing a man to enjoy himself. But ‘pardon’ may be of many kinds, and would always require some interpretation. The German *Abläss*, although better than ‘indulgence,’ is also too indefinite. In fact, the peculiar kind of spiritual ‘remission’ which is intended to be designated by the ecclesiastical and canonical ‘indulgentia’ cannot be defined by any one English term. And that is the reason why all serious persons who talk about ‘indulgence’ should be ready to listen to an explanation.

There are two inquiries on the subject of Indulgences which may be said to include the greater part of what is of interest. The first

¹ See Ducange, *Glossarium*, s.v. *Indulgentia*.

is, What does the Catholic Church mean by an Indulgence? and the second, What justification has she for her doctrine and practice?

There need not be much controversy on the first head. The Catechism which is taught in all our Catholic schools in this country has the following question and answer:—

‘Q. What is an Indulgence?’

‘A. An Indulgence is the remission of the temporal punishment which often remains due to sin after its guilt has been forgiven.’

The Catechism used in Scotland has a slight variation: ‘An Indulgence is the remission of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to sin after its guilt has been forgiven.’ A German manual called *The Catechism Explained*,² much used both in the original and in an English translation in the United States, says, ‘The remission of the temporal punishment due to us on account of our sins is called an Indulgence.’³

I have always found that these simple words have met, from many non-Catholics, with a kind of angry and bewildered opposition somewhat difficult to understand. They are intelligible enough on the surface. Sin is sin; sin entails guilt, and it entails punishment. Sin—that is, grievous sin—constitutes the soul of the sinner a grievously guilty soul, a soul deserving everlasting punishment. But grievous sin may be forgiven by God; it often is forgiven by Him—on what conditions we are not now inquiring. When grievous sin is forgiven, the soul from guilty becomes innocent, from black becomes white; as a consequence, when the soul is thus no longer guilty, it is free from the doom of everlasting punishment. This seems clear enough. But the Catholic view is that, even after the guilty stain has been taken away, and the dread sentence is no longer to be feared, *some punishment* may still remain. This punishment could not be ‘everlasting’ or ‘eternal.’ It would come to an end some time. It is therefore called ‘temporal’ punishment, as opposed to ‘eternal.’

It is not very surprising that this view should be argued against. But what is not so intelligible is that it should be rejected in so radical a fashion. One is forced to suspect that there is a disagreement in primary and elementary terms. It would seem that the signification of the word ‘sin’ to the Protestant mind is utterly different from that which it conveys to a Catholic. Probably it will hardly be disputed by the bulk of Protestants of the Low Church or Evangelical school, and the Nonconformists generally, that their idea of ‘sin’ is what I might well call the Lutheran and Calvinistic one—that ‘sin’ is an innate guiltiness of the soul which of itself deserves eternal punishment; that this state or condition is un-

² By the Rev. Francis Spirago. English translation edited by the Rev. R. F. Clarke, S.J. Benziger, New York.

³ P. 634.

alterable—that Christ our Lord saves those who ‘believe on Him,’ but without in any way cleansing or altering the soul’s inherent sinfulness (at least in this life). Now, on a view like this, mutual understanding becomes very difficult. By ‘sin’ the Catholic means a removable stain; the Protestant, a corruption which so pervades the nature that nature and corruption are equivalent terms. By ‘forgiveness’ the Catholic means the washing away of the stain, and the attainment of righteousness through the grace which is poured through the nature like light through water; the Protestant means only the merits of Christ—the soul itself remaining dead or foul as before, but being accepted for Christ’s sake. On the Protestant view it is evident that any distinction between eternal and temporal punishment, or any idea of forgiveness which does not imply total acceptance, is impossible. Does this explain why our doctrine of Indulgences meets *in limine* with so blind an opposition? Very few Protestants, I will grant, are utter Lutherans or thorough-going Calvinists. But no one can doubt that this doctrine of sin lies beneath the whole theory of forgiveness in the theology, and even more strongly in the common, unavowed and unconscious moral feeling of the majority of the non-Catholics of this country. There is one very curious proof of this. No non-Catholic—I except the High-Church Anglicans—when dying, ever makes, or is urged by friend or minister to make, an act of sorrow for sin. Neither in real life, nor in the novels of real life, do we ever observe that a sinner, however scarlet his sins have been, is expected to say, ‘I am sorry, for Thy sake and for Christ’s, that I have offended Thee. I detest my sins, and with Thy grace resolve to sin no more.’ Even if he is exhorted to ‘turn to God,’ or to ‘trust in Christ,’ it is not considered necessary that he should detest his past, rouse himself to regret the offence to God, and determine to sin no more. The reason is that regret is of no use: the human soul is sin, and a few sinful acts more or less make no difference: sin had to be, sin is, and sin will be. I would not for a moment impute this view to any one who disclaimed it. But my impression is that it prevails widely in this country. It goes far to explain why the very conception of ‘temporal punishment after remission of guilt’ is impossible. If it is repudiated, I am quite unable to understand why the Catholic theory should be so uncompromisingly rejected.*

* The doctrine of Calvin on the innate and permanent corruption of nature, entailing guilt which is not removed by faith or Sacrament, but only not imputed, is most important in its bearing on the teachings of the English Prayer-book and on the common Protestant views of righteousness. I venture therefore to cite a passage from his writings. It is taken from an interesting English translation of the *Institution of Christian Religion*, by Thomas Norton, and printed in London in the year 1587—the year before the Armada:—

‘Original sin is the perverseness and corruption of our nature which first maketh us guilty of the wrath of God, and then also bringing forth works in us which the Scripture calleth the works of the flesh. Therefore these two points are severally to

A word or two should here be said about the expression 'temporal punishment.' The Catholic view is, as I have said, that God does sometimes condemn to punishment those whom He has substantially forgiven. We read of King David that it was said to him: 'The Lord hath taken away thy sin; nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child that is born to thee shall surely die.'⁵

That the early Fathers of the Church were most fully persuaded that sin, even when pardoned, had to be expiated, needs no proof; even Calvin admits that such was the belief of the Church; but he says it was an error.⁶ It was from this belief that the 'canonical penances' of the early Church took their origin. Sin, although forgiven, had to be punished in this world or in the next. Punishment in the world to come meant Purgatory; punishment anticipated in this world meant the diminution of the pains of Purgatory, if not the escaping from them altogether. Hence, in those times the murderer and the adulterer were made to undergo a more or less lengthy discipline of fasting and of exclusion from the company of the faithful in and out of church; and it was taught that every kind of suffering or adversity, whether sent by God through the circumstances of life, or voluntarily taken up, had the power of expiation. It must not be supposed that God was imagined to be a despotic and capricious tyrant who took pleasure in exacting the last farthing. There is a sense, warranted by Scripture, in which it is true that the Divine justice does require the last farthing. But the teaching of the Fathers and of the Catholic Church was then (as it has always been) that suffering, to be efficacious, must be accepted by the heart, and that its value consists in turning the heart to God, in intensifying spiritual acts, and in purifying the passions and appetites.

It will now be clear how there came to be such a thing as an Indulgence. The Church imposed a canonical penance; the Church

be marked—namely, first, that we being in all parts of our nature defiled and corrupted are already, for such corruption only, holden worthily condemned and convicted before God. . . . The faithful are certified by baptism that this damnation is taken away and driven from them—that full and perfect forgiveness is granted both of the fault which should have been imputed to us and of the pain which we should have suffered for the fault. They take hold also of righteousness, but such as the people of God may obtain in this life—that is to say, by imputation only; because the Lord of His own mercy taketh them for righteous and innocent. The other point is, that this perverseness never ceaseth in us' (Book iv. ch. xv. n. 10). See also Book iii. ch. iii.

I need not here show how, from this doctrine, it follows that no punishment can remain due after sin has been forgiven, and how there can be no distinction between sins that entail everlasting death (mortal sins) and sins that do not. Both these points are explicitly taught by Calvin, the former in Book iii. ch. iv. n. 29, the latter in Book ii. ch. viii. n. 59. 'All sin is deadly . . . and the sins of the holy ones are venial or pardonable, not of their own nature, but because they obtain pardon by the mercy of God.' *

⁵ 2 Kings xii. 14.

⁶ *Institution*, L. iii. cap. iv.

‘remitted’ a canonical penance: in the latter act of jurisdiction we have an ‘indulgence.’ If it be objected that canonical penance has long ceased to be practised, but that Indulgences have grown and multiplied, the reply is that the Church claims the power of remitting penalties which she herself has not inflicted. For the canonical penances were only a sort of translation into material expression of the punishment that in any case would have had to be undergone. If the Church made a sinner fast, it was only because she knew he would certainly have to expiate his sin either by fasting or in some other way. So that when the canonical penances ceased to be imposed, the penance remained due all the same, and the sinner would have to account for it either here or hereafter. Stretching her hand, therefore, into the unseen, and using the power of the Keys, she did not hesitate, on good and sufficient grounds and due conditions, to free her children from a burthen which was none the less real because she had refrained from emphasising it by her own penalties. In this way is explained the peculiar phraseology of the grants of an Indulgence. For Indulgences are either plenary (that is, full) or partial. The word ‘plenary’ explains itself. It means the complete remission of all the temporal punishment to which a penitent may be liable in the sight of God at the time. The partial Indulgences are always expressed in terms of time, as an Indulgence of a year, of forty days, &c. These terms of time are taken from the ancient penitential discipline of the Church. To receive an Indulgence of a year, for example, is to have remitted to one so much temporal punishment as was represented by a year’s canonical penance. If you ask me to define the amount more accurately, I say that it cannot be done. No one knows how severe or how long a Purgatory was, or is, implied in a hundred days of canonical penance. Indeed, the very expression itself indicates a penalty subject to variation; for a year of one sort of punishment is not equivalent to a year of another. These things are veiled from our sight and are among the hidden things of Divine justice and mercy. What the Catholic Church teaches is, first, that she can make plenary remission of punishment; and, secondly, that the partial Indulgences, although we do not know what they exactly avail to remit, do most generously and mercifully remit in some degree those chastisements which are deserved. The whole subject of Purgatory is obscure. The Council of Trent defines that ‘there is a Purgatory,’ and the ordinary *magisterium* of the Church teaches that it implies exclusion from the Vision of God and much suffering; also that the greatness and duration of the sufferings of Purgatory vary according to the gravity of the sins to be expiated. It must always be remembered that no one goes to Purgatory except those who are already forgiven, as far as mortal sin and everlasting punishment are concerned; no one goes to Purgatory who is not secure, eventually, of the bliss of the Vision of God. We cannot doubt that its sufferings

are not merely 'vindictive,' according to the technical phrase, but that they are adapted to purify, elevate, and sanctify all the faculties of human nature, so that it may be less unworthy to see God. For human nature is very manifold and complex. It is not acted upon as the spark acts on the explosive, producing instantaneous and thorough conversion into something different. The infusion of the grace of Christ into the penitent soul does substantially make it once more God's friend, and its eternity is safe as long as it possesses that sanctifying grace. But the infusion of that grace does not purify all its powers, kill all its passions or dissipate all its darkness. These things, however, are not 'sin' in the proper sense of the word. In God's ordinary Providence, they are left to a more gradual, and generally a more painful, process. When the delicate shrubs of the French Riviera are weighed down by the cruel snow which sometimes visits those fair coasts, they revive as the snow melts, but they do not revive all at once. The bent fibre, the crushed leaf, the discoloured bloom, regain their shape, their soundness and their beauty only after the strong effort that nature makes through days of painful struggle. So it may be that in Purgatory the soul that God loves is painfully prepared to look upon His face.

Let me now, without going into the subject at any length, but merely for the purpose of further explanation, indicate the line of reasoning by which the Catholic Church justifies her claim to the prerogative of granting Indulgences. The Catholic doctrine, as I need not say, is that the souls of Christians are subject by the will of Jesus Christ to a certain spiritual jurisdiction, which can remit or refrain from remitting the sins and the consequences of the sins of the flock. This is the power of 'binding and loosing' which was given to the Apostles⁷ and specifically to St. Peter.⁸ It must not be supposed that this spiritual jurisdiction embraces and exhausts everything connected with forgiveness. Very far from it. The pastoral power of binding and loosing, like everything else in the Christian dispensation, is intended not to strangle the soul but to help it. If a soul truly and with sufficient intensity repents and turns to God (being willing at the same time to obey all Church ordinances), no machinery of loosing, no pastoral or ministerial action is required for that soul's complete justification. On the other hand, if a soul remains without repentance, not all the absolutions of all the hierarchy will avail to take away its sin. But between these two extreme points there is a wide field—this is the Catholic view—in which the power of the Keys may be exercised with advantage unto the consolation and the profit of poor sinners. I do not here stop to show how the power of binding and loosing is exercised in forgiving sins in the Sacrament of Penance, for we are not now concerned with the forgiveness of sins, but with the remission of punishment. Does this power of the

⁷ Matt. xviii. 18.

⁸ *Ibid.* xvi. 19.

Keys extend to the remission of the temporal punishment, as explained above, which oftens remains due to forgiven sin? It is the Catholic doctrine that it does. It is the Catholic doctrine that, by the will and commission of Christ, and through the merits of His Blood, the Church, through her pardon, has the power of loosing a soul, not only (as in the Sacrament of Penance) from sin itself, but also from that punishment which it would otherwise have to undergo either on this earth or in Purgatory.

This is the whole doctrine of Indulgences. As will be seen, it is not a doctrine that stands by itself, or that can be considered apart from the two great Catholic doctrines of inherent righteousness through Christ's Blood by repentance, and the prerogative of the pastorate to bind and loose. Those who dispute these two dogmatic and fundamental articles will also dispute the doctrine of Indulgences. But it is surely not claiming too much to assert that, if they are admitted, they alone, taken together, suffice to make it reasonable and valid. To complete what has been said, and to show both what the Catholic Church holds to, and how anxious she is to prevent and reform all kinds of possible abuses, I will cite the very words of the decree of the Council of Trent, Session xxv. chap. 21. I quote from Waterworth's translation, p. 277:—

Whereas the power of conferring Indulgences was granted by Christ to the Church, and she has, even in the most ancient times, used the said power, delivered unto her of God, the holy Synod teaches and enjoins that the use of Indulgences, for the Christian people most salutary, and approved of by the authority of sacred councils, is to be retained in the Church; and It condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them. In granting them, however, It desires that, in accordance with the ancient and approved custom in the Church, moderation be observed; lest by excessive facility ecclesiastical discipline be enervated. And being desirous that the abuses which have crept therein, and by occasion of which this honourable name of Indulgences is blasphemed by heretics, be amended and corrected, It ordains generally by this decree, that all evil gains for the obtaining thereof—whence a most prolific cause of abuses amongst Christian people has been derived—be wholly abolished. But as regards the other abuses which have proceeded from superstition, ignorance, irreverence, or from whatsoever other source, since, by reason of the manifold corruptions in the places and provinces where the said abuses are committed, they cannot conveniently be specially prohibited, It commands all Bishops diligently to collect, each in his own Church, all abuses of this nature, and to report them in the first provincial Synod, that, after having been reviewed by the opinions of the other Bishops also, they may forthwith be referred to the Sovereign Roman Pontiff, by whose authority and prudence that which may be expedient for the universal Church will be ordained, that thus the gift of holy Indulgences may be dispensed to all the faithful, piously, holily and incorruptly.

To make the whole subject more clear, and to satisfy the reasonable inquiries of many non-Catholics, we may now consider one or two of the more usual popular fallacies in regard to Indulgences.

One very common controversial statement is that the Catholic doctrine implicitly denies the all-sufficiency of the merits of Christ

to forgive, satisfy for, and remit all sin whatever, and all sin's punishment. But it is a fallacy to suppose that the Catholic Church for a moment questions this, or holds any other view than that guilt and punishment are never under any conceivable circumstances remitted to man except by and through the merits of Christ. The whole question is, whether, always supposing that Christ is the first cause and the complete cause, there may not be secondary causes—causes, ministers or instruments—which derive all their efficacy and virtue from Christ's merits, but are true and efficient causes all the same? Christians hold that God is the first cause of the motions of the heavenly bodies, of the seasons, of growth &c. But this does not prevent reasonable people from thinking that gravitation, and the various laws of heat and motion, indicate that the planets, the earth, the air, the sea, living creatures and man himself are real causes. The sacerdotal and intercessory theories, I am aware, are bitterly denounced by many. I have no objection to their being argued against; but to denounce them as derogating from the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice or the completeness of His satisfaction is a simple misunderstanding. The layman absolves from sin in baptism; but it is Christ who communicates that power to him. The priest absolves from sin in the Sacrament of Penance, or confers grace in any other Sacrament; but it is Christ who moves his hand and gives efficacy to his word. Dispute this—but do not misstate the view that it represents. To speak of Indulgences, I admit that the Church not only presumes to remit punishment (as explained above), but also claims, in that remission, to satisfy the offended justice of God. That is, she not only uses the power of the Keys to *remit*, but considers that she has something to offer which *satisfies*. Her power of remitting, as just stated, she professes to receive from Christ, her action deriving its whole validity and efficacy from Him. But whence does she get the 'satisfaction' which she dispenses, and which God accepts as expiation for the souls for whom she offers it? Has she the command of a 'treasure' of this kind? Her view is that she has; and every controversialist, at least of the older generation, knows the lively disputes that have been frequently occasioned by the discussion of the 'treasure of the Church.'

What, then, is meant by the 'treasure of the Church'—*ecclesiae thesaurus*? The expression, as I need not say, is metaphorical. It signifies a certain supply and abundance of spiritual advantages which it is in the Church's power to dispense. It exists in the invisible treasury of God's holy will and acceptance. It consists primarily and completely of the merit and satisfaction of Christ our Saviour. It includes also the superfluous merit and satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. What do we mean by the word 'superfluous'? In one way, as I need not say, a Saint has no superfluous merit. Whatever he has, he wants it all for himself;

because, the more he merits on earth (by Christ's grace) the greater is his glory in heaven. But, speaking of mere satisfaction for punishment due, there cannot be a doubt that some of the Saints have done more than was needed in justice to expiate the punishment due to their own sins. For example, the Blessed Virgin, according to the faith of the Church, never committed any sin; yet she suffered inconceivably. And if we cannot say quite so much for St. John the Baptist and other Saints, yet it cannot be doubted that their 'expiation,' made efficacious by loving acceptance, in union with the Passion of Christ, was far greater than was required for themselves. It is this 'superfluous' expiation that accumulates in the treasure of the Church. Let it be observed that we do not say that any Saint can do more than he 'owes' to God. When we have done 'what we ought,' then we are all 'unprofitable servants.' That is, because no man, nor all men together, can ever repay Almighty God for what He has done for us in our creation and redemption. We are here speaking of a particular manifestation of God's will—that a sinner must, often or generally, make some 'satisfaction,' or endure some expiatory punishment, after God has forgiven him. And we say that, in this particular, many of the Saints do more than is required.

On the principles already laid down, no one should raise the objection that by adding the 'satisfactions' of the Saints to those of our Divine Saviour, we are impeaching the all-sufficiency of His satisfaction. Our view is, on the contrary, that He has not only super-abundantly satisfied for all men's guilt and sin, but that He has imparted that efficacy of 'satisfaction' to the works of His Saints as to secondary agencies. The Catholic view is—and, I think, a very natural one—that it is more glorious to Jesus Christ to constitute and give efficacy to a magnificent *kosmos* of subordinate agency than to be Himself the sole, as He is the primary, effective cause. Can any one doubt that this great principle is clearly indicated in Holy Scripture? It was on the day before the night of the destruction of the Assyrian host that God sent this message to Ezechias: 'I will protect this city and will save it, *for My own sake, and for the sake of David My servant.*'⁹

But is the disposal of this 'treasure' in the hands of the Church? If we once admit that the Church can release from the kind of punishment of which we have so often spoken, and that such release 'satisfies' the justice of God, it follows that the Church must, in so doing, make use of, and dispense, the abundant 'satisfaction' of Jesus Christ; for there is no other way in which she can do it. At any rate, it is the firm and clear teaching of the Church that the Indulgences which she grants not only 'remit,' but, in remitting, satisfy. When St. Paul pardoned the incestuous Corinthian, it was

⁹ 4 Kings xix. 34.

not his sin that he pardoned, but his punishment; and it was no mere ecclesiastical penalty that he remitted, such as excommunication by the local Church; it was more than that Church could do, or could venture to claim: for St. Paul speaks in a most solemn way as if he were exercising a prerogative of Christ Himself, '*in the person of Christ, that we may not be over-reached by Satan; for we are not ignorant of his devices.*'¹⁰ Here it is plain that the Church of Corinth had let St. Paul understand that the excommunicated sinner, now penitent, was likely to 'be swallowed up in over much sorrow.' The Apostle, therefore, pardons him. A pardon 'in the person of Christ' is a pardon in the eyes of Christ, not merely in the eyes of the Church. Can it be supposed that St. Paul, in remitting the sinner's punishment, left him still liable to punishment in the judgment of God? Almost the same form of speech is used by St. Cyprian, in a well-known passage.¹¹ The holy Bishop is writing to a distant Church. He has heard that some of the lapsed have received 'certificates' (*libellos*) from martyrs, 'whose prerogative it is to help such persons *before the Lord.*'¹² He fears that he may be prevented from coming in person to receive back into communion these penitents, whose canonical penance has thus been begged off. He directs, therefore, that whether he is there or not, these penitents, having 'confessed' and 'having had hands imposed upon them unto penance'—a most clear reference to the Sacrament of Penance—shall come back to the Lord with the 'peace' which the martyrs have asked for. We have here in the phrases 'before the Lord' and 'coming back to the Lord,' parallels to St. Paul's claim to speak 'in the person of Christ;' and the 'peace' which is referred to is that remission which the canonical penance was intended to effect, but which the generous intercession of the martyrs has accelerated. But we have more than this. The martyrs (and the ancient bishops) had no doubt that martyrs could thus interfere with, or alleviate, canonical penance. On what grounds? On the grounds of Catholic fellowship—in other words, of the communion of Saints. It is clear that this feeling of 'communion,' or community of holy things and holy persons, carried with it not only the right and duty of intercession for one another, but the common participation of expiatory suffering; for why had the martyrs this prerogative except because they were 'martyrs'—that is, because they were specially distinguished by suffering? All might intercede; the martyrs only could claim to make their brethren share their expiation. Thus, in the third century, there is clear evidence of a 'treasure'—that is, of merit and satisfaction which can be transferred from one soul to another. Now, the

¹⁰ 2 Cor. xi. 10.

¹¹ *Epistola XII.* of the Benedictine edition, Venice, 1728.

¹² '*Praerogativa eorum apud Deum adjuvare possunt.*' These words are wanting in some MSS., but they are not really essential.

Catholic Church considers herself to be the dispenser of the whole of that store of merit and satisfaction which consists, primarily, of the satisfaction of Christ, and, secondarily, of that of the Saints—a store which is inexhaustible precisely because it includes the infinite satisfaction of the Cross. Christ is the Head; men are members of the same body; what one does all share in; and the Church, holding Christ's commission to rule and lead, regulates the administration of all.

It cannot be denied that the large majority of non-Catholics think, and repeat, that when the Church grants an Indulgence, she thereby grants permission to sin with impunity; and, further, that such Indulgences can be had for money. It is difficult to know how to stop this kind of assertion. If you explain—as I have endeavoured to explain—quoting Councils and Catechisms, they will tell you that theory is one thing, practice another; that the theoretical statements of the Church may be defensible (though erroneous), but that the practice of Catholic authorities, especially in the ages just before the Reformation, has been, and is, nothing less than scandalous.

No Catholic denies that there have been what may reasonably be called scandals, and grievous scandals, in connection with the proclamation and promulgation of Indulgences. But they have arisen not so much from any misstatement, or even popular misunderstanding, of the doctrine, but almost wholly from the fact that the contribution of money has been one of the conditions for gaining them. In principle, there can be no harm in imposing a money offering for such a purpose. To give of one's means towards a good purpose, such as missions to the heathen, the support of ministers of the Gospel or the building of churches, is a good work, and a work entailing sacrifice and inconvenience. The scandal occurs when unscrupulous men either show themselves indecently eager to gather the money, or misappropriate it when gathered. This occurred sometimes in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; and it was for this reason that the Council of Trent¹³ decreed that the 'name and use of questors of alms be henceforth utterly abolished in all parts of Christendom whatsoever,' ordering, at the same time, that, in future, Indulgences should be proclaimed by the Ordinaries of the place, aided by two members of the Chapter.

On the main question—whether the Church (or any considerable Catholic authority) ever taught that Indulgences forgive sins, past or future—I believe there is no historical ground whatever for any except a negative answer. I am aware that some Protestant writers such as D'Aubigné, have stated that Tetzel, who preached the celebrated Indulgence which aroused Luther's indignation, promised the people that he would give them 'letters by which even the sins

¹³ Session xxi. chap. ix.

you intend to commit may be pardoned.' But it is to be most carefully noted that Luther himself never accused Tetzel of claiming to give an indemnity for future sins. Let the fair-minded reader examine Luther's famous *XCV. Theses*, and I shall be astonished if, even from their evidence, he does not arrive at the conclusion that Tetzel held and proclaimed the exact doctrine that the Church holds at this day. But we have also the *CX. Antitheses* in which Tetzel replies to him. They, at least, are plain enough. To adopt Janssen's summary,

Tetzel, in these propositions insists principally on the following points: that Indulgences do not forgive sin; that they only remit the temporal punishment of sin, and only when the sin has been repented of and confessed; that the doctrine of Indulgences does not in any way diminish the belief of the Catholic in the sole efficacy of the merits of Christ, since an Indulgence rather substitutes Christ's merits for man's expiation.¹⁴

This evidence, and the clear teaching of the Council of Constance, one hundred years before Luther was heard of, and of Pope Leo X. (1518), ought to be sufficient to show what the Catholic teaching was in Luther's time. Bishop Creighton, in his *History of the Papacy*, has lent the weight of his authority to the assertion that the Church has altered her doctrine on Indulgences since the time of the Reformation scandals. There were scandals; but there is really no evidence, except that of polemical non-Catholics, of any alteration of teaching.¹⁵ On the other hand there is clear proof, in the *Instructio Summaria* issued in Saxony to the preachers of the Indulgence, that the true nature of such remissions was carefully explained to the people. Unfortunately, the admitted abuses, already spoken of, lent themselves to picturesque and racy description. People remember such phrases as Luther's 'coin chinking against the bottom of the money-box,' and Tyndale's 'quenching the fire of hell for three-halfpence.' But in spite of such misrepresentations, the faithful knew what Indulgences meant. Speaking especially of this country, Abbot Gasquet says: 'In the literature of the period' (that is, about A.D. 1500) . . . 'there is nothing to show that the nature of a pardon or Indulgence was not fully and commonly understood. There is no evidence that it was in any way interpreted as a remission of sin, still less that any one was foolish enough to regard it as permission to commit this or that offence against God.'¹⁶

It is sometimes objected that the very words in which the grant of an Indulgence has at times been made—words which in more modern days have been carefully altered—show what was the theory

¹⁴ Quoted from the French translation, *L'Allemagne et la Réforme*, vol. ii, p. 79.

¹⁵ This question, and other matters connected with it, are well discussed by the Rev. F. Sydney Smith, in a brochure entitled *Luther and Tetzel* (Catholic Truth Society).

¹⁶ *The Eve of the Reformation*, p. 437.

of the mediæval Popes. Can you deny, we are asked, that Indulgences have been granted expressly *a poenâ et culpâ*? What does that mean, except 'from punishment and guilt'? Some writers of great authority, such as Pope Benedict XIV., have given it as their opinion that all Indulgences in which this phrasing is used are spurious.¹⁷ However that may be, there can be no doubt that it was a popular phrase from about the thirteenth century onwards. But it seems to be quite certain that all the theological writers who treat of it consistently explain it as including confession, and therefore not as meaning that an Indulgence forgives sins. Their teaching—I am speaking of writers between the thirteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth—is practically unanimous that *indulgentia a poenâ et culpâ* does not pretend to remit guilt, and that, in order to gain any Indulgence, the 'state of grace' (a Catholic expression for 'freedom from the guilt of sin') is absolutely necessary. They offer explanations of the phrase in question which vary to a certain extent, but they all agree in the points stated. We gather from them that it was not a form of words chosen by theologians, but rather a popular fashion of speaking, derived from some more full and formal legal expression. Many Catholic writers think—and I agree with them—that it is a condensed form of expressing the two points which the grant of a great Indulgence always contains—the remission of punishment (as explained) and the removal of reservation of jurisdiction in the confessional. To understand the latter point, it must be remembered that for an Indulgence confession is required. Now, in the Middle Ages, and to a certain extent at this day, there are a number of heinous descriptions of sin which an ordinary priest has no power over (in the confessional), but which the Bishop, or even the Pope, 'reserves' to his own jurisdiction. This is often very hard upon the penitent—and it is intended to be hard. But, at a jubilee, or great Indulgence, this reservation is generally taken off, so that any confessor can deal with any sins whatsoever. There seems to be little doubt that the expression *a poenâ et culpâ* was a stock phrase conveying in a condensed and convenient form what I have stated. And if it was ever used by a Pope, or if it is ever used again, this was, or will be, its significance.¹⁸

It is not my purpose, in this paper, to write a treatise on Indulgences. I have tried to give, in plain and simple words, a statement of the Catholic view—or, as we should call it, the Catholic faith. But it should be well understood by our non-Catholic friends that the doctrine of Indulgences, and the practical outcome of that doctrine, are not things that the Church at this present day in any

¹⁷ *De Synodo Diœcesana*, xiii. 18, 7.

¹⁸ For a fuller treatment of this matter the reader may profitably consult the recently published *Holy Year of Jubilee*, by the Rev. Herbert Thurston (Sands & Co.).

way wishes to conceal or to apologise for. On the contrary, Catholics are convinced that the preaching and the practice of Indulgences are of the utmost profit to the souls of Christians, religiously, morally, and devotionally. They protect the true doctrine of sin and sin's remission. In our view, nothing can be more deadly or condemnable than the view that these souls of ours, with all their blindness and infirmity, are not capable of being restored, by the infusion of Christ's grace, to a regenerate and holy state, in which they become pleasing to God, not merely because He will not 'impute' their sinfulness, but because their sinfulness has turned to innocence. Nothing can be more fatal and destructive than the view that the acts of a soul, even after 'acceptance,' are still corrupt and deserving of damnation. Such teaching leads to the repudiation of the moral law; for why strive to do good when bad can be reputed good by only leaning on Christ? I do not believe that many non-Catholics go by any means so far as this. I admit that Calvin himself, all through the *Institution*, protests, although with poor reason, against such a practical inference. But, as he himself very strongly declares, others had no such hesitation. The doctrine of Indulgences keeps alive the grand truth that a soul may be holy and yet may be liable to punishment; may be in the state deserving of everlasting bliss, and yet not pure enough to be admitted at once; may be at peace in the Blood of Christ, and yet may feel itself bound to strive and suffer and use Christian ordinances to make more sure of admission to glory and of perseverance in grace. The doctrine of Indulgences keeps up faith in the world to come. The prevalent practice in the modern Christian world, such as we know it in these countries, is to live in and for this world, and to leave the question of the soul's lot in the next world 'to God.' A holy phrase! But if, as Catholics hold, God has made it known that contrition, amendment, Sacraments, and the spiritual jurisdiction of His Church will have enormous effect on the lot of the soul after death, then the ordinary use of such a phrase is really to seek safety in shutting one's eyes. Morally, the practice of Indulgences, as Catholics well know by experience, is to make the Christian heart more and more sensitive to the defilement of sin and more and more inclined to religious ways. We call Indulgencies a 'remission,' and so they are. But the conditions on which they are almost invariably granted make that remission really a substitution or commutation. An Indulgence is offered if a man prays, in such a place, for such and such a purpose; and it also presupposes all the spiritual activity that is implied in the Sacrament of Penance. So that it comes to this—that an Indulgence cannot be gained unless there is increased attention to God, lifting up of the heart to Him, and consequent nearness to Him. Nor is it any reply to say that all this spiritual emotion could occur, or be excited, without Popes, pardoners or jubilees. The visibility of the

Church, and the external ministry of the sacramental system, is, as we hold, part of Christ's ordinance. And it is apparently intended for a grand moral purpose. It is intended to deepen, to regulate, and to intensify interior religion. If we believe our Lord's word, the essence of the Christian spirit is a certain childlike docility. It is a simple fact that a man cannot be childlike unless he has practised himself in submitting to another man, and in conforming himself to an external ordinance which he has not established for himself. We all know that spiritual acts, such as worship, oblation, petition, and contrition, are apt to cease, to ebb like the tide of the sea, from the sand of our conscious nature, in the business and absorption of life. A command of authority, a fixed duty, a determined time, a defined exercise—all the manifestations of external ministry—are so many calls and warnings, so much exhortation and stimulus, to the things we forget most easily. Moreover, no philosophical mind will deny that the external act intensifies the internal. To visit a church, to kneel, to receive Holy Communion, to bow the head under absolution, to follow the Sacrifice, to visit the tombs of the martyrs—such things put a certain pressure on the mind, will, and heart. Even ritual—allowing for the variety of temperament, of nationality and of education—may be said to be, generally speaking, a Divinely ordained means for elevating the spirit of man towards his Creator. If the doctrine of Indulgences is liable to abuse, it shares in this respect with many of the most Divine and profitable ordinances that our Redeemer has left us. If the practice of that teaching has been abused, the Sovereign Pontiff and the Bishops, and the vast body of the clergy and laity are united in a firm determination to put down all such abuses, as far as human endeavour can do so. But the doctrine and the practice will go on. We are anxious that non-Catholics should understand our position, and when they do, it will certainly be found that their opposition and dislike are grounded not on the behaviour of the mediæval pardoners, the rapacity of the German questors, or the incautious language of a preacher here and there, but really on differences and (as we hold) errors of their own which lie much deeper, and which affect the fundamental doctrines of the religion of Jesus Christ.

JOHN CUTHBERT HEDLEY.

NOTE ON THE PAPAL INDULGENCE AT OBERAMMERGAU

[By the Editor]

In the November number of this Review (on page 824) the following passage appeared in an article signed by 'L. C. Morant':—

'His Holiness has bestowed upon him' (Josef Mayer) 'a pardon not only for all his own sins, past and present and future, but also, with a truly lavish generosity, for those of all his children. It is with a face of genuine pride and wholesome satisfaction that this grey-bearded child of Rome shows to a few favoured visitors the slip of paper signed by the Pope which means so much to him and his.'

This statement was immediately and warmly challenged by Cardinal Vaughan and other Catholics. The Cardinal wrote as follows:—

Dear Mr. Knowles,—Please read in *Nineteenth Century*, page 824, twelfth line from top of page, a shocking piece of ignorance or of malice. The thing is just simply impossible. Will you print a short contradiction of it, in your next issue?

Yours sincerely,

HERBERT CARD. VAUGHAN.

I sent on the Cardinal's letter to 'L. C. Morant, Esq.', and wrote:—
'I assume you would not have made such a statement as you have done without a full and entire knowledge of the facts. May I ask you kindly to send me, at once and in detail, the proofs of it, that I may transmit them to the Cardinal?'

I received an answer from 'Lilian C. Morant,' (whom I then first learnt to be a lady), saying that she had not seen the document herself, but that a friend had done so, from whom she derived her information, and who now wrote to her, '*I cannot quite remember the words*'!

She added that should the Indulgence granted to Josef Mayer prove, when literally translated, to be nothing more than a mere dispensation of the Church's censure she should, of course, be willing to make a very sincere apology to Cardinal Vaughan and myself.

I replied that I trusted, for her own sake as well as mine, she

would without loss of time take the necessary steps to clear up the matter, adding that surely, unless the reproduction and translation of the original document fully justified her published version of it, 'a very sincere apology to Cardinal Vaughan and myself' would by no means meet the merits, or rather demerits, of the case.

Meanwhile I had received, through the kindness of another correspondent, Mr. Hugo Lang—who had been greatly vexed and distressed by Miss Morant's article—the subjoined accurate copy of the document in question. I gladly publish it in correction of the misleading account of it sent me by Miss Morant. Mr. Lang, who is himself an Ammergau, had communicated direct with Herr Josef Mayer, the Burgomaster of Oberammergau, who had replied to him as follows :—

'The document in question, with a portrait of the Pope, has been hanging in my sitting-room since the year 1890, when I received it. It is there for anybody to see or read who cares to and understands Latin. It is nothing but a "special blessing by the Holy Father," which blessing also confers, I believe, what we call an "Abläss"—but a pardon for sins to be committed is simply inconceivable.'

The Indulgence itself is as follows :—

Beatissime Pater,

Josef Mayr ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus humillime petit Benedictionem Apostolicam cum Indulgentia Plenaria in articulo mortis pro se et pro suis consanguinibus et affinibus usque ad tertium gradum inclusive secundum formam ab Ecclesia praescriptam.

Et Deus etc.

Vigore specialium facultatum a SSmo D. N. P. Leone XIII. tributarum S. Congregatio Indulgentiarum benigne annuit pro gratia iuxta preces absque ulla Brevis expeditione, contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae ex Secretaria ejusdem S. Congregationis die 4 Julii 1890.

L. S.¹

(Translation.)

Most Blessed Father,

Joseph Mayr, prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, most humbly asks for the Apostolic Blessing with a Plenary Indulgence at the moment of death, for himself and for his relations by consanguinity and affinity to the third degree inclusively, according to the form prescribed by the Church.

And may God, &c.

¹ The 'L. S.,' meaning *Locus Signi*, indicates where the Seal was in the original.

By virtue of special faculties given by Our Most Holy Lord Pope Leo XIII., the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences has graciously granted the favour as requested, without any issue of Brief, notwithstanding anything to the contrary.

Given at Rome on the 4th day of July, 1890.

It was not until the 21st of December that an identical copy of the Indulgence reached me from Miss Morant, and on the same day I received the subjoined letter from her for publication. I confess that I cannot find in it the 'very sincere apology' which, under the circumstances now established, might, I think, have been expected. And I especially regret her omission, from the quotation of her own words which she professes to give, of all the most offending of those words—('past and present and future,' &c.)—an omission which seems hardly ingenuous. I publish her letter, however, as it stands and must leave the Cardinal's doubt unsettled as to whether the original statement he complained of was 'a shocking piece of ignorance or of malice.'

To the Editor of the 'Nineteenth Century'

December 20, 1900.

Dear Sir,—In an article published in the November number of your Review, I stated that the Pope had bestowed on Josef Mayr 'a pardon, not only for all his own sins, but also for those of all his children.' As this statement was immediately and emphatically denied by authoritative members of the Roman Catholic Church, I procured a copy of the document in question, which in justice to those concerned I gladly forward to you for publication. Instead of the word 'pardon,' I should have used the term 'Plenary Indulgence,' which has, I am informed, nothing to do with the remission of sin, but 'only remission of certain punishments due to sin.'

It is a matter of great regret to me that this mistake should have occurred, but I was unaware that the significance of a Plenary Indulgence had been materially altered by any Council of the Church since the time of the Reformation. But whatever meaning a Plenary Indulgence may now have for modern enlightened Catholics, it is quite evident that it still conveys, to the ignorant and simple-minded, the original idea of *pardon* which it formerly carried. In support of this assertion I am able to produce a singularly convincing and apposite piece of evidence.

In forwarding me a copy of the Indulgence in question, Josef Mayr wrote me a brief explanation of how it came into his possession, at the conclusion of which he remarks, '*I believe that an absolution is pledged with the enclosed.*'

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
L. C. MORANT.

LORD ROBERTS ON ARMY REFORM

[THE subjoined article by Lord Roberts (then Lieutenant-General Sir Frederick Roberts) was published in this Review for June 1884, and is here reprinted at the urgent request of some who consider 'every word of it as true and as applicable to-day as it was then.' It has long been out of print, and is now difficult to obtain. The words near the conclusion which I have ventured to italicise have a more serious import for the country at this moment than they can have had at any former time.—ED. NINETEENTH CENTURY.]

FREE TRADE IN THE ARMY

THE Secretary of State for War, when returning thanks for the army at the dinner given by the Lord Mayor to Her Majesty's Ministers on the 9th of August last, is reported to have said, 'While I do not now deprecate that the attention of army reformers should be turned to our army system, and that they should suggest all necessary improvements, I do beseech those interested in the army to look at it with an eye to the future, and not with an eye always turned to the past. It is in that way we shall best correct the deficiencies of our army organisation. To look to the past, and to that which is no longer suited to the day in which we live, is not to promote the cause of army reform.'

I have ventured to address the public twice before on the subject of the army, and on both these occasions I appeared in the somewhat unenviable rôle of a critic. Criticism can only do a certain amount of good, and in my opinion, those who have the welfare of our army at heart ought to be prepared not only to point out defects, but to suggest remedies. Lord Hartington has expressed a hope that all suggestions should be made 'with an eye to the future,' and that the much debated question as to the merits of long and short service should now be considered as definitely settled. It is no doubt very desirable that the subject of our army's future should be approached without any bias towards one system or the other; but before any satisfactory conclusion can be arrived at as to the system most likely

to produce such an army as England requires, it seems absolutely necessary to inquire into the causes which have prevented all systems hitherto tried from being successful.

While concurring with Lord Hartington that a return to the old long service is impossible, I firmly believe that a continuance of the present short service is equally impossible. If this be the case, it will be readily admitted 'that the military problem which has to be solved by our War Department is one of no ordinary character.'

Both systems have failed to produce the required number of recruits. Various reasons have been given for this, and various remedies have been suggested; but the true reason has apparently not been discovered, and the proper remedy has certainly not been applied. When a sufficiency of soldiers was not to be had in 1869-70, it was decided that recruits disliked long engagements, and the short-service system was introduced. The number of men who enlisted after the change was made certainly increased considerably; but whether it was because they preferred short to long engagements, or because the standard of height was reduced at the same time, is open to question. With reference to this, it is instructive to turn to the register of fluctuations in the standard for the infantry, which immediately succeeded the introduction of Lord Cardwell's measure, and to note the successive lowering from 5 feet 8 inches, at which the standard stood under the long-service system early in 1870, to 5 feet 6 inches in July, and 5 feet $5\frac{1}{2}$ inches in September of that year, 5 feet 5 inches in July 1871, and 5 feet $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in 1873. Now if any one will take the trouble to calculate the extent of the recruiting field which lies within the compass of these $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches—that is, the number of English lads between 5 feet $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches and 5 feet 8 inches in height—he will realise that the increase in the number of recruits was not altogether due to a preference for short service. During the last thirteen years, the standard has only twice been up as high as 5 feet 6 inches, and on each of these occasions for a few months only; and notwithstanding the advantages which the present short service system is supposed to offer, the dearth of recruits and the impossibility of keeping men in the army necessitated the standard of recruits being reduced, a few months ago, to an almost dwarfish height (5 feet 4 inches), and to a bounty being offered to soldiers unprecedented in its amount.

It would seem, then, that the problem we have to deal with is not likely to be solved by the adoption of a long or a short service, but by an earnest endeavour to discover the causes which have made the army unpopular with the class on which it depends for its very existence as a voluntary force. The voluntary nature of the contract into which the British soldier enters with the State is, indeed, the all-important factor in our military system. With a compulsory service, the number of men required to fill the ranks are taken, and they

have got to adapt themselves to the terms of that service, whether they like them or not. With us, if the terms do not suit the would-be recruit, he simply declines to accept them. When, therefore, we find that the army has ceased to be attractive, we may be sure that some grievances exist (imaginary or otherwise), which ought to be inquired into, and removed if possible, or that the wants and wishes of the soldier are not sufficiently understood. If we are to have a voluntary army, we must have a contented one. To get recruits, in the first place, we must make military service popular; and to keep a sufficient number of men in the ranks, we must deal fairly and honestly with our soldiers. Such compensation for service abroad must be given as will induce men to put up willingly with its drawbacks; and to those who have no trade or employment to fall back upon, a reasonable prospect must be held out of securing for themselves a provision for life, if they behave themselves properly and choose to continue their career in the army.

To those who care to look below the surface, the disease from which the British army is suffering is most marked. Bacon says, 'Wounds cannot be healed without searching;' it is to be regretted that this maxim has not guided our army reformers, who, instead of probing the sore to the bottom, have been satisfied with mere surface treatment, trusting to theoretical knowledge to enable them to deal with a wound which, in reality, requires all the skill of practical experience. One cannot but marvel at the persistent way in which changes have been made without regard to the wants and wishes of the soldier, and without due weight having been given to the opinions of regimental officers, who are chiefly interested in the contentment and efficiency of the men serving under them, and who, from their practical experience, are in the best position to observe the effects of any change of system. It would seem as if the importance of providing good material for the ranks, and of rendering the army a desirable profession for soldiers, had not been sufficiently considered.

Let us look at the question from the soldiers' and from the regimental officers' point of view, who are (though the fact seems to have been forgotten) the most important element in any given body of troops; we may thus perhaps be able to devise some scheme which will satisfy the soldier, and have the happy result of keeping our army up to its normal strength, while a reserve is gradually being formed without impairing the efficiency of the first line.

By taking the soldier into our confidence, we shall, I think, find that the following two causes have mainly tended to make the army unpopular with him and his younger brothers, the soldiers 'in posse':—

(1) That condition of the territorial system which precludes all freedom of will, combined with uncertainty of the future.

(2) An absence of elasticity in the army system, the existence of

which would enable those who so desire and behave well to make the army their profession, and render it possible for those who find military duty distasteful to revert, while still young, to civil life.

While admitting that the territorial system has many advantages from the administrator's point of view, from the soldier's it has certain drawbacks, which necessitate greater freedom in the conditions of his service. In the first place, the constitution of our army, to say nothing of the unforeseen demands which may be made upon it on account of war, prevents the system (as at present applied) being carried out in its integrity. In some districts the supposed local recruiting ground is almost entirely barren, and consequently the regiments called after these districts are territorial only in name. War breaks out, and to enable the ranks of the battalions going on service to be filled, we are obliged to have recourse to the system of bounty (so universally condemned), in order to attract volunteers from other battalions; men who have extended their service to remain in India, and whose time is not up when their battalion returns to England, must be transferred to complete their tour of foreign service to some regiment belonging to another district unless they are relieved by their linked battalion; re-engaged men, who wish to prolong their service in India, are permitted to volunteer for any battalion having a certain number of years of Indian service still to run. In this way, a man who originally enlisted at Exeter for the Devonshire regiment, may be transferred to the Royal Munster Fusiliers to complete his time abroad, and, by volunteering, may possibly end his career in the Gordon Highlanders. Seeing, then, the impossibility of the territorial system being carried out at present, in the manner its originators no doubt hoped it would be, and seeing that considerable laxity has to be permitted in its working, it seems but right that the system should be susceptible of some corresponding elasticity to meet the inclination of the soldier.

As a rule, the battalion in which a man first makes his home is the one he will like best to the end of his service, and constant compulsory change, or even a liability to such change, does more to make soldiers dislike the army, and kill the 'esprit de corps' that used to exist, than anything else. What possible sympathy can the man have who has been drilled and set up as a Royal Scot with his future comrade the Royal Dublin Fusilier? Each regiment, nay each battalion, has its own particular ideas on the subject of interior economy, and what the young soldier has been taught to consider the correct thing in his old regiment may be deemed a breach of barrack-room etiquette in his new corps. A soldier cannot understand why it should be thought that the fact of his having entered the Queen's service should make him indifferent to all considerations of country, climate, or friends. Formerly, when a man made up his mind to become a soldier, he knew pretty well what he was about; if he enlisted

for a particular regiment, it was because he could reckon on remaining in it; if he wished to go abroad for a certain number of years, he chose a corps which would, in all probability, return home at the expiration of the desired time; if he wished to serve at home, he picked out a regiment which had just returned from foreign service; and if he was actuated by none of these considerations, he frequently (and this especially as regards the better class of recruits) selected a regiment to which he was attracted by the presence of friends and acquaintances, or of officers who were interested in himself or his family.

The would-be soldier of the present day cannot suit his fancy or convenience in any of these particulars, and instead of being able to settle down in some corps, and make it his home, he must be prepared to join a strange battalion in China or the East or West Indies, with as perfect equanimity as if he had no more feeling than a bale of goods. He finds himself suddenly separated from his friends and acquaintances, and being thrown amongst an entirely new set of men, has, so to speak, to begin the world over again. He arrives as a stranger; his former efforts to raise himself in the estimation of his superiors are lost; his capabilities are unknown. It is deemed necessary to put him through his drill again from the commencement of the field exercise, and although he may have prided himself on being one of the smartest men in his old battalion, in his new corps he is known only as 'one of that wretched draft we got the other day from the home battalion.' He becomes discontented and indifferent as to how he puts in his time, and when remonstrated with, replies, 'Oh, I'm only for six years, what does it matter? What do I care whether the battalion is considered smart or not? When it goes home, I shall be handed over again with the barrack furniture.'

There are other causes which affect the present condition and prospects of the soldier, and react in dissuading the would-be recruit; notably, the frequent changes in the terms of service, which have been so varied that men can feel no certainty, even as to their immediate future. Many a man who would like to remain in the army, and might be invaluable as a non-commissioned officer, is deterred by the fear of some new warrant, materially affecting his future, being unexpectedly issued, and so hesitates to accept his stripes or prolong his service. He remains in an unsettled state, until some day a petty punishment or a whim makes him desert, or determine to leave the army as soon as his first period of service is up. Soldiers do not, as a rule, study Royal Warrants, but they know and can see that changes are continually going on, and that a good man, who wishes to prolong his service, is ruthlessly discharged one day, while a few months later a large bounty is offered to try and induce any sort of character to extend his service. This is extremely puzzling to the soldier, who, on failing to account on common-sense principles for what he sees

going on, becomes suspicious. Ask him what it is that has caused him to purchase his discharge, or prevented him from re-engaging; the answer in most cases will be, 'Well, sir, I don't care to soldier any longer; it's the uncertainty, you see, sir.'

Further causes of discontent, which would seem to point to the necessity of some elasticity in our army system, are the many petty troubles and inconveniences soldiers are subjected to, without apparently any reason or necessity. Objectless repetitions of purely parade movements; constant guard mounting, with its accompaniment of impaired health from 'sentry go;' being associated with bad characters; the constant and distasteful work required from recruits; the dismissal to which non-commissioned officers were lately subject when reduced by a court-martial; the want of recreation (this applies especially to India); and their low social position. Some of these are inseparable from military service, but should be made as light as possible; others are capable of remedy, and should be removed. Again, on enlistment a man is told that he will get one shilling a day with free rations. He afterwards finds that heavy deductions¹ are made for messing, necessaries, washing, hair-cutting, barrack damages, library subscriptions, &c., and (in India) for cooking and summer clothing. All these demands considerably reduce the shilling which had such attractions for the recruit, and, as he is not told of them beforehand, they seem to him a breach of faith.

Then, again, whatever may be the reasons which induce a man to enlist, he may find after a time that he has made a mistake; the unaccustomed habits of discipline and the monotony of routine life become intolerable to him, and he begins to think how he can escape from them. If it were possible to get away after a short probation, he would most likely resolve to make the best of a bad business and serve

¹ STOPPAGES PER MENSEM

<i>At Home</i>			<i>In India</i>		
	£	s. d.		RS.	A. P.
Messing, at 4d. per diem	0	10	4	9 pies per diem	1 7 3
Washing, at $\frac{1}{2}$ d. "	0	1	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	per mensem	0 10 0
Hair-cutting per mensem	0	0	1	"	0 0 9
Library "	0	0	3	"	0 2 0
Barrack damages . .	0	0	1	"	0 2 0
				Cooking	0 10 0
Total	0	12	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	Total	3 0 0
			converted into English money		
			at 1s. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per rupee = 5s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d.		

So far we have noted the stoppages which are invariably deducted from the soldier's pay, but there are other expenses which must be paid for by him. For 'necessaries,' viz., drawers, shirts, socks, towels, blacking, knife and fork, summer clothing, &c., a sum of money is deducted from his monthly pay whenever he may have to replace any of the above articles, averaging 2s. a month in England, and Rs. 1-8-0 in India while experience shows that the men find it necessary to supplement the Government ration by extra food, such as meat, flour, and vegetables, the ration itself being insufficient.

out his time ; but with six or seven weary years before him he becomes desperate, and deserts. Or, a man may have private reasons which render his return to his village or family imperative, but if he is unable to purchase his discharge he cannot get out of the army until he has served his time. A story was told me the other day, by an officer of experience in one of our Line regiments, which bears on this point. Shortly before his battalion embarked for India, one of the best men in his company asked leave to speak to him. The man's story was a simple one. His father had lately died, and his mother, who had no other near relation, had made up her mind to go to America. The son declared that he could not let his mother go alone, and appealed to his old friend Major——, who had known him since his recruit days, to help him. The Major heard the man's story, but he had to tell him, as kindly as he could, that it was impossible to meet his wishes, and as he had no money to purchase his discharge, he must make up his mind to embark for India. A few days afterwards the private deserted, but, before the battalion sailed, Major —— got a letter from him, returning his kit, and expressing his deep regret at the step he had felt himself compelled to take. Now, had some rule been in force, such as the one which obtains in our Indian army, by which a soldier can claim his discharge after three years' service, the private whose story I have just related could have left the army a free man, instead of being obliged to avoid all who had known him, lest he should be recognised and punished as a deserter. The privilege of being able to claim their discharge is one that is highly appreciated by native soldiers, and is not made use of to any inconvenient extent ; and it is, without doubt, the chief cause that desertion is a crime almost unknown in the Indian army.

The causes I have above enumerated are, as any regimental officer will say, the principal reasons of the army being unpopular ; and they are discussed in all their bearings in every canteen and barrack-room throughout the service. This is to be expected. England has every right to demand that the men who are paid to fight her battles should obey their officers implicitly, and be prepared to sacrifice themselves, when necessary, for their country's good. Of their readiness to do this the British army is one long and glorious proof. Upon subjects, however, which closely affect their personal comfort and prospects, it is useless to expect that men will not have their own ideas, or will not comment freely upon them one to another.

I will now endeavour to show how, in my opinion, matters may be remedied. The basis of any future reforms should be—

(1) That soldiers should be made to understand exactly the terms under which they enlist, and once they have accepted those terms, no change should be made in them without their consent.

(2) That army service generally should be made easier and freer ;

the status of the soldier raised; and, so far as may be practicable, more consideration paid to his wants and feelings.

There must, in fact, be free trade and reciprocity in the army, by which I mean, the sweeping away of many hard-and-fast rules, which now unnecessarily hamper the soldier's life, from the hour of his enlistment until the day of his leaving the army. Men ought not, and, indeed, in these days of enlightenment, will not, be forced to submit to this, that, or the other irksome condition, to which when enlisting, they had no sort of idea they would be subjected.

What we want is, that the contract to be made between the State and the soldier should be advantageous to the former and satisfactory to the latter. The State on its side requires an army, sufficient both for its home duties, and for the protection of its widely scattered possessions, capable also of expansion, to meet the heavy demands that a European war would entail upon England's limited military force. At the same time, it not unreasonably desires that men should be employed only so long as they can efficiently perform their work, and that the cost of the army should be reduced as much as possible, not only in its current expenses, but as regards future charges on account of pensions. These requirements cannot be obtained by the adoption of a long service, which is incompatible with a reserve, nor of a short service, such as the present one, which is not short enough to form an adequate reserve. Our present difficulties would, indeed, seem to have arisen from a determination to create a reserve out of our small first line, and at the same time keep up a fighting army to meet the varied demands made upon it by India and the colonies. We must look for some system which will possess the advantages of both a long and a short service, by means of which a reserve can be formed, an effective army maintained, and the number of men serving for pension restricted to those who make the army their profession, either from choice or necessity, and whose lengthened employment in the ranks will be well worth paying for.

The term of service for which a man now enlists, and which may be assumed to average about seven years, is perhaps as fatal a period as could have been fixed upon, whether the convenience and welfare of the soldier or the interests of the State be considered. Let us take the three classes, artisans, labourers, and loafers, from which our recruits are mainly drawn, and see how it affects each of them.

The artisan gives up his trade just at the age when he should be finishing his apprenticeship. At the end of his seven years' service he is too old to begin learning again, or to have any hope of obtaining the position, or earning the wages he might have expected, had he devoted those seven years to perfecting himself in and practising his trade. It does not seem, therefore, to the advantage of the artisan to be sent adrift after seven years with nothing to show for his military service but a well-set-up figure, and 21*l.* in his pocket, and

with the liability of being called out with the reserve at any time during the next five years, for the sum of 6*d.* a day.

Now let us see how the labourer fares. Take a man from the plough for two or three years, and it is conceivable that he may return to it; but after having changed all his habits of life, received a certain amount of education, and become accustomed for seven years to very different employment, it is improbable that he could ever again take to the ordinary work of a daily labourer. He feels that he is fit for something better, but being unable to obtain congenial employment, he is likely to become an idle, discontented man, attributing his misfortunes to his enlistment, and thus acting as a most effectual scarecrow to the young men of his neighbourhood.

Lastly, let us consider the loafer, or the street arab² who has grown tall enough to pass for eighteen years of age. After seven years of decent living, decent clothes, decent companionship, and enforced education, it is hardly possible that he would return contentedly to his former life. Yet it is difficult for him to avoid doing so. No respectable civil employment is offered to him by the State; he has no home, he knows no trade; dig he cannot, to beg he is ashamed, but there is nothing else left for him to do. The advantages of his past life only make the contrast more bitter when he is thrown upon the world again. Surely, it must be a bad thing for recruiting that such men should go about the country in an unhappy frame of mind, attributing their misfortunes (as they always do) to their seven years' army service; all the benefits of that service are forgotten; all the drawbacks carefully remembered and dilated upon to anyone who will listen to them.

When the soldier's time with the colours is up, he enters upon his period of five years' reserve service, with its pay of sixpence a day—a sum too small to live upon, but sufficient, in many cases, to make the recipient shirk work; while the prejudice against employing a reservist (liable to be called away for active service)³ is so strong that the mere fact of a man being one often interferes with his chance of getting permanent employment. Indeed to obtain this, he may have to deny the fact of his belonging to the reserve, and even to forego the advantage of drawing reserve pay. This accounts for the otherwise unintelligible fact of so many reservists of good

² A valuable class of recruits might be obtained from reclaimed waifs and strays, if the system of training-schools were developed. The merits of this most charitable and philanthropic movement have been long recognised by thoughtful men, both in and out of the army, and its advantages have been, from time to time, brought before the public. The Navy benefits considerably by these institutions, and military officers bear testimony to the excellent quality of the non-commissioned officers who enlist from the Royal Hibernian school in Dublin and the Duke of York's school at Chelsea. Every boy should be taught a trade at schools, so that he may be fitted to revert eventually to civil life in some useful capacity.

³ The reserve has been called out twice during the past five years.

character failing to apply for their pay. When the reserve has been called out we have heard much of the large percentage of those enrolled who have answered to the call; but we have heard nothing of the numbers who are quarterly struck off the rolls of the reserve; they are not included in the total against which the percentage is calculated.

If we proceed further, we shall, I think, find that the seven years' period of service is equally disadvantageous to the State. Half of the Line battalions form our normal foreign garrison. Experience proved that a six years' term of service was too short to fill the ranks of these battalions, and, about two years ago, the period of colour-service was raised to seven years for soldiers at home, and eight years if the soldier happened to be abroad when the seven years expired. More recently, soldiers on foreign service have been invited, and induced by large bounties, to prolong their colour-service to ten or twelve years; and, lastly, short service has been virtually suspended at the option of the soldier, and every approved man has the right of entering on long service, with the prospect of eventually acquiring a pension. This last change came suddenly; all the regulations preventing a private soldier from prolonging his army service, and directing the summary discharge of a reduced non-commissioned officer, were swept away, and free trade became the order of the day. So far, recent action has, in my opinion, been in the right direction, but all prospect of permanently good results has been marred by the avowedly temporary nature of the measure. The general order, opening a career to the soldier, declares that these free terms are to continue 'until further orders' only, and the Secretary of State for War has publicly stated that this judicious departure from the conflicting rules of the past is intended to meet the present difficulty alone. In other words, the previous state of uncertainty as to the future has been intensified instead of being removed.

It may be presumed that the Government believes in the efficacy of these new terms since they have been offered at a time of great necessity, and no doubt they would be very attractive if there were any degree of permanency in them. Let us see what they are. Line soldiers may be enlisted for seven years' army service and five years' reserve service, and they may prolong their army service to twelve years, and afterwards re-engage to complete twenty-one years. Soldiers of the Foot Guards, on the other hand, may enlist either for three years' army service and nine years with the reserve, or for twelve years' army service; and the three-years' men may prolong their army service to seven and twelve years successively—all having the same right of re-engagement as the Line. But why were the more liberal terms offered to the Guards withheld from the Line? It must be presumed that there was a fear that three-years Linesmen, who must necessarily be kept at home during that period, would

decline to continue their army service just at the time they were required to be sent abroad, and that the present difficulties would be reproduced in another form in the future. If this be the case, much that this article is intended to prove is admitted; for it follows that there is something wrong in the conditions of foreign service which have not been made to suit the soldier. I am inclined to think that these periods of enlistment—viz., three years and twelve years—would prove the most suitable for our army; and that if its organisation is made to fit in with them, we shall arrive at the proper application of the short-service system to the conditions of our empire. We should then have:—

(1) Three-years men, who pass early out of army service and form the bulk of the reserve;

(2) Long-service men, who pass beyond the first period of three years in army service, and who, for the most part, will make the army their career.

The first class would practically form the regular portion of our home force, while the second class would exclusively compose our foreign army. It would follow, therefore, that if foreign service is distasteful to the soldier as compared with home service, it must be made worth his while to go on foreign service, and sufficient attraction must be held out to cause him to pass from short to long service. The best inducement would clearly be to render military life less irksome during the early stage, and to improve its conditions after the first three years are up. We shall thus, by a natural process, attain (as I ventured to suggest on a former occasion) an organisation suited to the military requirements of our empire—viz., a short service for home defence, with its consequent reserve, and a long service for our Indian and Colonial garrisons. If it be asked how the transition from one class to the other is to be effected—how we are to make sure that a certain number of the men enlisted will take on—it must be answered that the question is one of terms; we must make the terms of first service sufficiently attractive to bring men into the army, and we must make those of prolonged service sufficiently good to keep them in it. To become a long-service soldier should be regarded as a privilege. As confidence is restored, we may hope to approach this grand result; once attained, let us not trade upon it by treating the recruiting question solely as one of supply and demand, and by commencing, when the immediate necessity for the increased number of men is over, to clip and pare the privileges which have been conceded. Let us keep steadily in view the first principle laid down above, that the conditions of service must be certain and permanent.

With a three years' enlistment, the seven years' period would necessarily be abolished, and though men extending their service must do so for a stated time (say to twelve years), men should, as

an indulgence, under ordinary circumstances, be permitted to leave army service and enter the reserve at any time. In regulating the discharge by indulgence, there should be a gradually falling scale of purchase money, commencing afresh with each prolongation of service. In exceptional cases, on explanation of the urgency of the cause, it should be possible for a soldier to get a free discharge at any period of his service.

To give the system as proposed, or, indeed, any system, a fair chance of success, all its details must be carefully worked out. Whether a man serve for three years or twenty-one years, the questions of his training, career, status, food, and clothing, pay and pension, and his final employment either in the reserve or as a discharged soldier, must be examined into, and have as much attention given to them as an engineer would bestow on the most insignificant parts of the machinery which is destined to impel some powerful engine.

Time and space will not admit of these points being discussed at length, but it seems desirable to offer a few remarks upon each, so far as they are connected with the object of this paper.

Training.—The impressions which the young soldier derives from his preliminary training affect him throughout his career, and if his recruit life is made too hard, he soon becomes discouraged. If the process of forming the soldier were made a little less harassing, he would not be so anxious to leave the ranks. There is reason to believe that the partial training at the *dépôt*, as at present organised, is not of much practical use. The staff is insufficient (especially where militia recruits who join at all times of the year have to be drilled) to give more than a superficial training, and the same ground has to be gone over again when the man joins his battalion. The sooner, therefore, he is sent to his battalion the better, and when there, time should be allowed for a thorough recruit-training before the soldier is placed in the ranks for duty. When once he becomes a duty man, and is on the roster for guards, &c., he looks upon recruit's drill as extra work.

Career.—One of the main reasons noted in an early part of this article for the present feeling of uneasiness in the army was the objection to compulsory change of battalion. It has been said that this is purely sentimental, that men change willingly, and that they often do so for a very small gratuity. This is true, and the fact may be admitted without affecting the argument. We have to deal with the dislike to compulsion. Men will frequently do of their own free will what they strongly object to being forced into doing.

With a three years' and twelve years' service system, a man would clearly understand that during the shorter engagement he would serve in the United Kingdom, except in the case of war, and that if he elected for the longer engagement he must be prepared to go

abroad. If the battalion with which he is serving is near its turn for foreign service, he should continue with it; if, on the other hand, the linked battalion has a certain number of years to run before it returns home, he must join it. Once this has been settled, the soldier should never again be liable to transfer from the battalion in which he has been required to prolong his service, whether it may be at home or abroad, unless he himself volunteers. A difficulty must occur when both battalions of a regiment are on foreign service, which is incidental to the present organisation. A remedy in the case of war was provided for in the original scheme, as has lately been pointed out by Sir Patrick Macdougall.⁴ The measures recommended by the committee, of which this distinguished officer was the president, will be found in paragraph 35⁵ of their report (command paper No. 493, dated the 22nd of February, 1872). The contingency of both battalions being abroad in time of peace does not seem to have been contemplated; but it must nevertheless be arranged for, and that portion of the war scheme which involves the calling out of militia battalions to take the place of the army battalions abroad would seem best adapted to meet it. When the force abroad is increased, the home army must also be increased, or the double-battalion organisation will break down; and the readiest and most economical way of providing a temporary increase consists in utilising the militia. The militia battalions called out will practically, for the time being, become Line battalions, and the process carried on by the home Line battalion will then devolve on the militia.

Status.—As regards status, much may be done both within and outside the army. The social position of soldiers even in the non-commissioned ranks is unfortunately very low. A good deal of this is owing to prejudice, but much is due to the misbehaviour of a few men in each regiment, who bring discredit on the whole. It is the

⁴ *Nineteenth Century*, September 1883.

⁵ 35. Supposing it were desired, immediately on the outbreak of war, to send to the scene of action 50 battalions of infantry without diminishing the Indian and Colonial garrisons, the despatch of that expeditionary force would leave 50 out of the 70 pairs of Line battalions without any Line battalions at home. The active measures consequent on such a contingency may be assumed somewhat as follows:—

(1) All Line battalions at home to be raised to war strength, the 50 expeditionary battalions being first considered, by calling up army reserve men to the colours, supplementing the deficiency, if any, by militia reserve and volunteers from militia battalions.

(2) In each of the 50 districts required to furnish expeditionary battalions embody both militia battalions.

(3) In each of the remaining districts embody one militia battalion.

(4) Complete each depot centre to a full battalion to serve as a training battalion for recruits.

(5) Complete all embodied militia battalions to war strength.

(6) Make all enlistments during the war for general service in the Line and militia battalions of any brigade district.

presence of these men which lowers the average of good conduct. As a first step towards social reform, all bad characters must be cleared out of the ranks; but this cannot be done until there are sufficient means of preventing their re-enlistment. In former times such men were marked, and it was impossible for them to re-enlist. Now there is no bar to their immediate return to the army. A man discharged with disgrace one day may present himself at the nearest recruiting depôt the next, and be accepted as a promising recruit.

This fact causes general officers to hesitate before confirming a sentence of 'discharge with ignominy,' especially in the case of young soldiers. It is true that re-enlistment, under such circumstances, renders a man liable to the heavy penalty of penal servitude—a punishment especially severe for an offence, in itself trivial, and which could never have been committed but for the sentimental outcry in the name of humanity against what was termed 'branding.' This cry, taken up by Parliament, through an entire misconception of the practice, has resulted in the creation of a new offence, and the condemnation to lengthened terms of imprisonment of hundreds of men who, if prevented from re-enlisting, would have committed no offence at all. Let this be once understood, and it is inconceivable that Parliament would be unwilling to sanction so humane a practice as marking. What is wanted is some trustworthy means of recognising, at the medical inspection of recruits, those who have previously served in the army. The simplest way is to impose some particular mark in the nature of tattooing the men discharged as bad characters. This would certainly be a mark of dishonour; but it need not be distinguishable as such, or indeed be seen at all, except under medical examination. If such marking be objected to, let an honourable mark be placed on every officer and soldier serving in Her Majesty's army. The presence of such a mark on anyone offering for enlistment would not necessarily be a cause for rejection, but it would oblige the recruit to declare his former service, and show that he was entitled to re-enlist. A mark of honour for all ranks would have another great advantage; it would act as a powerful deterrent to desertion, and would assist materially in the detection of the deserter. This is a matter which may usefully commend itself not only to the notice of humanitarians, but also practical soldiers and military administrators; and it would be well if the intense evil of bad characters in the ranks, the pernicious influence they exert on young soldiers, and the utter impossibility of preventing their free circulation throughout the Service, together with the very simple remedy which lies ready at hand, were brought prominently to the notice of the Legislature. This reform contains in it the germ of a vast economy, both in men and money, and is of the first importance in the consideration of any scheme for the

regeneration of the army. When we have succeeded in keeping bad characters out of the army, we may hope to get good ones in, for the class of recruits will certainly improve as the body they join rises in quality.

Food and Clothing.—Numerous deductions, varying according to climate and circumstances, are now made from the daily pay of troops on account of food and clothing. Would it not be a simpler arrangement to pay a soldier a certain fixed wage (however small it might be), and to provide him with everything to enable him to perform his duty, and live respectably? A man could not then be disappointed by getting less than he expected on entering the army, as he would know for certain what he was entitled to receive under every condition of service, provided he did not misconduct himself. Rations should include what is now known as 'extra messing,' without which a man is not sufficiently fed; and clothing should mean not only uniform, but underclothing and cleaning requisites, now termed 'necessaries.' Sea-kits should be issued gratis as required, and the light clothing for tropical climates should be equally a State provision with the scarlet and blue. Whatever the material may be, a soldier's uniform should be neat and smart; the full dress the most attractive that can be provided, consistent with a reasonable economy; the fatigue and fighting dress of the plainest and most workmanlike description. Washing and hair-cutting, which are fixed monthly charges, should be borne by the public.⁶

Pay and Pension.—The requirements of the soldier being thus provided for, the amount he should receive in cash as daily pay must be settled.⁷ If it is insufficient to attract recruits and to keep a certain number of men in the ranks, it must be increased; but it may safely be assumed that fair average wages would not be rejected, if the army is made a desirable home for the soldier, and he has a reasonable prospect of pension or State employment when no longer fitted for military duty.

On prolonging his service at the end of three years, the daily pay should be somewhat increased, say, by threepence; ⁸ a similar increase

* These details may appear trivial to the public generally, but, as a matter of fact, the soldier attaches great importance to them.

⁷ When deciding upon the net pay for the several ranks, it should be understood that all lance-corporals and lance-sergeants are to receive extra pay as laid down for those ranks, and not, as at present, only a proportion of each rank. We profess to give a lance-corporal of infantry threepence a day more than a private soldier, but he only gets the extra money for half his service as a lance-corporal: during the first half he gets nothing. It would be better to say at once that the infantry lance-corporal shall receive an increase of 1½d. a day; this at least would be some inducement to a man to take upon himself the responsibility of a first stripe, and that some inducement is much required is well known to commanding officers. But I am far from advocating any such half-measures, and think that all holders of the lance-stripe should receive the pay laid down for their rank by Royal Warrant.

⁸ The additional pay should be subject to forfeiture, but the forfeiture should be by direct award, and not dependent on some other punishment, as is the case with

being given to the man who re-engages after twelve years' service, this latter increment to be in the nature of deferred pay. These increases would not entail the heavy charge which might, at first sight, be supposed, as it is intended that they should be met by doing away with good-conduct pay, and deferred pay, in its present form.⁹

After re-engagement, the soldier should be entitled to a pension; the principle being that every re-engaged man (who, by the very fact of his being permitted to re-engage, may be considered to have done twelve years' good service) should have established his claim to a pension, if he continues to conduct himself properly, and if he is not good-conduct pay; and, for reasons which military administrators will readily understand, the rules prescribing the forfeiture should be regulated by Royal Warrant and not by Act of Parliament.

The power of awarding forfeiture might be according to some such scale as the following:—

A general court-martial, absolute forfeiture, or for a certain number of years.

A district court-martial, one year.

A regimental court-martial, three months.

A commanding officer's sentence, thirty days.

This plan would provide a system of fines for general offences, corresponding (in some degree) to the fines at present authorised for drunkenness; and it admits of small offences being sufficiently marked and punished without subjecting the offender, who may be a good man, to the degradation of punishment drill. A fine is the best kind of punishment where a reminder alone is required to bring a man to his senses, and is peculiarly appropriate in the case of British soldiers, nine-tenths of whose crimes may be traced to drink. By depriving him of the means of exceeding, the source of crime is removed.

*** COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE PAY OF A PRIVATE OF INFANTRY
UNDER PROPOSED AND PRESENT SCALES**

The totals given are total receipts during service. The good-conduct pay is calculated on the most favourable terms.

At 3 Years' Service

<i>Present Rate</i>	<i>£ s. d.</i>	<i>Proposed Rate</i>	<i>£ s. d.</i>
3 years' ordinary pay, at 1s. .	54 15 9	3 years' net pay, at 1s. .	54 15 9
1 year's good-conduct pay, at 1d. .	1 10 5	3 " equivalent of free mess- ing, necessaries, &c., at 4d. .	18 5 8
	56 6 2		
Total gain .	16 14 10		
	73 1 0		73 1 0
Gain = 5 <i>l.</i> 11 <i>s.</i> 7 <i>d.</i> per annum = 3½ <i>d.</i> per diem.		it	

At 12 Years' Service

12 years' ordinary pay, at 1s. .	219 3 0	12 years' net pay, at 1s. .	219 3 0
4 " good-conduct pay, at 1d. .	6 1 8	12 " equivalent of free mess- ing, necessaries, &c. at 4d. .	73 1 0
6 years' good-conduct pay, at 2d. .	18 5 0	9 years' additional pay, at 3d. .	41 1 10
	243 9 8		
Total gain .	89 16 2		
"	333 5 10		333 5 10
Gain = 7 <i>l.</i> 9 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i> per annum = 5 <i>d.</i> (nearly) per diem.			

otherwise provided for by State employment, in which case his pension would remain in abeyance. With the revival, however, of the permission to serve on for pension, and consequent on the abolition of good-conduct pay, as proposed, some change might conveniently be made in the scale of pensions, especially for the lower ranks. It is the latter period of a soldier's service—viz., from sixteen or seventeen to twenty-one years—which is so often unprofitable to the State, if he is still included among the rank-and-file, and it would be advantageous to enable these worn-out men to leave at an earlier age than at present. Some of the older soldiers might be provided with extra-regimental posts; but in the fighting ranks of the army, service should, as a rule, cease at seventeen years, or at the average age of thirty-five. For such men a suitable pension should be available with a graduated scale (as at present) to be decided on by the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital, according to the nature of each case, commencing with sixpence a day for men over twelve years' service, and attaining a maximum at seventeen years' service.¹⁰

<i>At 17 Years' Service</i>							
<i>Present Rate</i>				<i>Proposed Rate</i>			
	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
17 years' ordinary pay, at 1s.	310	9	3	17 years' net pay, at 1s.	310	9	3
4 „ good-conduct pay, at 1d.		6	1 8	17 „ equivalent of messing, necessaries, &c., at 4d.	103	9	9
6 years' good-conduct pay, at 2d.		18	5 3	14 years' additional pay, at 3d.	63	18	4
4 years' good-conduct pay, at 3d.		18	5 3	5 „ deferred pay, at 3d.	22	16	7
1 year's good-conduct pay, at 4d.		6	1 8				
	359	3	1				
Total gain .	141	10	10				
	500	13	11		500	13	11
Gain = 8 <i>l.</i> 6 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per annum = 5½ <i>d.</i> (nearly) per diem.							

¹⁰ In fixing the rate of pensions regard should be had to the following considerations, which materially affect the contentment of the several ranks. It should be remembered that regimental non-commissioned officers perform the most arduous and troublesome duties of any of their class. The functions of those among them who are fortunate enough to get staff employment may be more important, but their work is comparatively easy. This principle, which is well understood in the case of officers, should apply also to the non-commissioned ranks; the reward of the more important services being higher pay and attendant advantages, but not a higher rate of pension. Subject to modification in accordance with these considerations, and to the extension of the scale to an earlier period of service, the pensions of sergeants and superior ranks might remain at the present rates. Some rough edges in the Pension Warrant which operate harshly might, however, conveniently be rounded off. For example, the service—viz., three years—in a grade required to qualify for pension in that grade appears in some cases to be too long. The regulation also which requires that pensions shall be decided by the rank held by a soldier at the time he attains twenty-one years' service tells hardly on boys who begin to reckon their service from time of enlistment, or about fourteen years of age as a rule. They do not come on for promotion until they are men, but complete twenty-one years' service while still

It has been said that good-conduct pay should be done away with. This pay, obtainable at the rate of one penny a day, after certain periods of good behaviour, and represented by a badge or chevron, is not altogether a satisfactory system of reward, and the regulations¹¹ by which it is worked often operate with great and incalculable severity. The badges are not worn exclusively by the best-behaved soldiers, and it is possible for a man with several badges to lose one of them by sentence of a court-martial, and to be entitled to wear the remainder when released from prison. Should it be considered desirable to retain the badges, there seems to be no reason why the chevron should not still be given (entirely independent of pay) to mark certain periods of average good conduct.

Deferred pay, in its present form, although no doubt theoretically perfect, and generally popular with soldiers, fails to work well in

comparatively young; yet all advancement of rank subsequent to the completion of twenty-one years goes for nothing, and it may easily happen that of two colour-sergeants of the same age, who come up for discharge together, the one who may have given good service as a boy, and been in the army for a longer term of years, will receive the smaller pension. Above all, in fixing the rate of pensions the record of a soldier's early errors should not be carried too far. If he has not behaved well, he is unworthy to continue in the Service, and should be discharged; but if he is allowed to re-engage for pension, he should (subject to good conduct) receive according to a fixed scale.

Speaking generally, the scale of pension should be modified as follows:—

(1) The minimum service at which pension of all ranks could be obtained to be twelve years instead of fourteen, and the earlier pensions to be given on more liberal terms than at present.

(2) The maximum pensions of Classes IV. and V. (see Royal Warrant) to be attained at seventeen years' service, instead of twenty-one years'.

(3) The maximum pensions of Classes I., II., and III. to be attained (as at present) at twenty-one years' service, but all non-commissioned officers of and above the rank of sergeant to be allowed to increase their pension until twenty-one years' service, without reckoning boy's service.

¹¹ It seems unnecessary to describe these Regulations further than to explain that (setting aside the direct forfeiture by sentence of court-martial of good-conduct badges, which are the vehicle for the grant and deprivation of good-conduct pay) a penny is forfeited by the award, either by court-martial or the commanding officer, of any punishment which is entered in the Regimental Defaulters' book. Good-conduct pay is, in fact, subject to forfeiture for bad conduct generally, just as the ordinary pay is forfeited for continued acts of drunkenness; the difference being that the rules prescribing the forfeiture of ordinary pay are laid down by Act of Parliament, while the loss of a good-conduct badge, and its accompaniment of one penny a day, is regulated by Royal Warrant. As the recovery of the penny is subject to uninterrupted good conduct for one or two years, according to circumstances, and since so trivial a punishment as eight days' confinement to barracks, or the deprivation of a single day's pay for a few hours' absence, constitutes a regimental entry, a heavy fine is made consequent to the light punishment without any option of remission. It also happens that the same nominal punishment awarded to a good man and a bad man is, in reality, much heavier in the one case than in the other, the bad man probably having no good-conduct badges to be deprived of. And, again, as the grant of future increments depends upon the possession and recovery of former pennies, and pension is determined by the number of pennies enjoyed at the time the pension is fixed, it follows that the consequence of one single offence (possibly a light one) may affect a man's income through life.

practice, for owing to the principle on which it is now granted, an almost irresistible inducement is held out by the State for men to leave the service just when they are becoming valuable in the ranks. The prospect of 18% or 20% of ready money is too much for most men. But what use do they make of it? Nineteen times out of twenty the money is of no benefit to the recipient, but rather a source of evil; it is soon spent, leaving him to regret that he ever left his regiment; and the position becomes very curious when it is found necessary to offer a bounty for continuance of service with the colours in India, for then the Government bids against itself; in one hand it jingles the sovereigns of the deferred pay; in the other, the rupees of the bounty. Late experience has proved how powerful the former is in counteracting the attractions of the latter, for only a small proportion of those who could grasp at once deferred pay have accepted the large bounty offered for the extension of Indian service.

The system of deferred pay might with advantage be retained for the re-engaged soldier, and continued to all ranks alike for five years, the period of service proposed for the attainment of full rate of pension in the lower ranks. By restricting deferred pay to re-engaged soldiers, it would act as an inducement to men to leave the Service voluntarily when they are no longer required to remain in it, and its cessation after a fixed time would operate in the same direction. It would be a boon to the old soldier, and would help him to settle down in comfort, and there is less probability of its being squandered, as it would come to him at a time of life when he may be expected to know better what to do with it.

Final Employment.—We now come to the question of the final employment of the soldier either as a member of the reserve, or discharged as a pensioner. With a short service of only three years before passing to the reserve, it is hoped that men will return easily to civil life, and that the probability of their remaining undisturbed will be greatly increased; for with a long service open to those who wish to make the army their profession, it may reasonably be expected that there will always be such a sufficiency of trained soldiers in the ranks as would obviate the necessity of calling out the reserve, except in time of imminent national danger, as was the original intention.

If this result be secured, some of the principal difficulties with regard to reserve men will have disappeared. At the same time, their position must always demand the careful attention of all classes, official and private. If we are to maintain in the ranks of civil life a large body of trained soldiers as a reserve, ready at call for the defence of their country, it is the duty of all to enable these men to live. The public obligation towards them cannot cease with a dole in the shape of reserve pay. Many might be employed in public offices, or in some way under the departments of the State. Let the

Government set the example, providing for as many reservists as possible, and permitting them to attend their training (which should be carried out annually) without loss of pay ; it might then be hoped that the public would follow suit. If employers would act towards reserve men in this spirit, the tax on the patriotism of the nation would still be but small, compared with that which the Continental countries of Europe have to pay in the shape of forced service ; and if we must look at the question from a commercial point of view, let it be remembered that any inconvenience that might arise from the employment of reserve men would be but an infinitesimal premium on a valuable policy of insurance. If nothing be done to benefit reservists, the reserve, instead of being a strength to the army, may prove the destruction of our voluntary system of recruiting.

Then, again, the question of State occupation for discharged soldiers should be seriously taken up. If pensions have to be given to a certain number of men in order to maintain an efficient army, they must be liberal, or else an equivalent must be found. The most convenient equivalent would be suitable employment in Government offices, which requires less physical labour than the army demands. Hitherto, these situations have been filled without regard to the peculiar claims of the army and navy on the State ; a great source of economy is thus lost, and a means of making the army popular neglected. Much is done by private societies, notably the Corps of Commissionaires, under its patriotic and indefatigable founder, to assist discharged sailors and soldiers ; but such employment as these societies are able to provide is no economy to the State, and private employers benefit by the pensions which would be saved if some of the many valuable Government posts, now given to civilians, were reserved for competent naval and military pensioners.

In the above remarks, I have confined myself to what appear to be the principal causes of the unpopularity of the army, and have suggested such remedies as seem to me desirable ; and I have endeavoured to draw the attention of the public to, and enlist their sympathy with, a question which concerns them very closely, if they will only believe it. *An army we must have, if we are to continue as an Imperial Power, or even exist as an independent nation ; and if this army cannot be obtained by voluntary means, we shall have to resort to Conscription.* What sacrifices that would entail it is my earnest hope British homes may never be called upon to realise.

FRED. ROBERTS.

Madras.

THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
AND AFTER



No. CCLXXXIX—MARCH 1901

THE CIVIL LIST

By a constitutional practice extending over two centuries, one of the very first Acts of Parliament in a new reign is that known as the Civil List Act. From the time of William the Third to the time of Queen Victoria these statutes have all had a common character, however much they have differed in details. They all make provision out of public funds for the maintenance of the household of the King for the time being. They are all grants from the House of Commons to the King. They all deal with certain revenues of the Crown. They all expire at or soon after a demise of the Crown.

The Civil List Act of Queen Victoria was the second statute of that long reign. There has been no need, as there had been in the case of some of her predecessors, for any amending Act. It described itself as an Act for the support of Her Majesty's Household and of the

honour and dignity of the Crown. Its main provisions are well known. It granted to the Queen the following annuities, classified, after the manner of votes in Supply, under six heads :—

	£
Class 1. Her Majesty's Privy Purse	60,000
Class 2. Salaries of Her Majesty's Household and retired allowances	131,260
Class 3. Expenses of Her Majesty's Household	172,500
Class 4. Royal Bounty Alms and special services	13,200
Class 5. Pensions to the extent of £1,200 per annum	
Class 6. Unappropriated moneys	8,040
	£385,000

These payments were all charged by the Act on the Consolidated Fund, and could not be altered except by another Act of Parliament. Cumbersome and complicated as the Act now appears to be, it really is the simplest of the series, and the new Civil List Act of the new reign will probably be simpler still.

This List of authorised payments is what is generally meant by the phrase 'the Civil List.' All except one—the item of pensions—relate to the personal or Court expenditure of the Sovereign, although some of the household offices are used for political purposes. But with these exceptions the provision made is for the purposes of the Court alone, and 'Civil List' is now an inappropriate name. Macaulay derides the continued use in this country of a title which has ceased to have its original meaning, and still more the use of the title by foreign countries, in imitation of our practice but without our justification. The phrase carries us far back into the history of the British Constitution. It had a real meaning until quite recent times. The Civil List Acts of William the Third, of the Four Georges, and even of William the Fourth, provided for much more than the expenditure of the Court. The first Civil List Act (English) was the one passed in the ninth year of William the Third, and it provided to a large extent for the whole Civil Government of the country. The salaries of public officials and the pensions of those who were fortunate enough to get them accounted for a large portion of the expenditure. The evolution of the Civil List has resulted in nearly all of these public charges being withdrawn. They have either been charged on other public funds or abolished altogether. All that remained in the late Queen's Civil List of the charges which gave it its title were the pensions and those household salaries which had been diverted to political uses. It would be strictly in the line of historical development if these too were withdrawn from the Civil List of Edward the Seventh. The Pensions are administered by the Government of the day under regulations as precise in many respects as those which govern the salaries of ordinary Civil servants. The Vice-Chamberlain and the Comptroller of the Household are Parliamentary Whips coming in and going out with the party to which they belong. Payments apportioned

in this fashion cannot fairly be said to be part of the public expenditure borne for the purpose of maintaining the household of the King, and if they are to be continued they should be charged to the account to which they properly belong.

The Civil List with these exceptions provides only for the personal and household expenditure of the reigning Sovereign. It has been the custom to make provision for other members of the Royal Family by direct grants. In the early years of Queen Victoria's reign these annuities, payable out of the Consolidated Fund, including the annuity of 30,000*l.* to the Prince Consort, amounted to more than 300,000*l.* In 1837 the total was 341,788*l.* In 1870 it had sunk to 110,000*l.* When the Select Committee of the House of Commons reported in 1889 it had risen to 152,000*l.* In that year application was made to the House of Commons for some provision for two of the children of the Prince of Wales, with the result that on the recommendation of the Select Committee a 'special fund' of 36,000*l.* per annum was created payable from the Consolidated Fund, out of which His Royal Highness was to be empowered 'to make such assignments and in such manner to his children as he should in his discretion think fit.' This annuity was to be limited in terms to the 'present reign.' The others of course were for the most part made payable for the lives of the recipients. The total amount of such payments to members of the Royal Family in the last year of the Queen's reign may be taken to have been 153,000*l.*¹ The total cash provision for all members of the Royal Family may thus be taken to have been at the last about 540,000*l.* per annum.

By far the greater part of these annuities will lapse in consequence of the demise of the Crown. The whole of the Civil List arrangements, the annuities to the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the special fund for their children, come to an end.

Besides these 'cash provisions' the revenues of two Duchies have been paid to the Queen and the Prince of Wales. The Duchy of Lancaster yielded in 1899 a net revenue of 60,000*l.* to the Queen, and the Duchy of Cornwall rather more to the Prince of Wales.

The expenditure sanctioned by Annual Estimates for purposes connected with the Royal Family is more difficult to calculate, but I should suppose it cannot be less on the average than 80,000*l.* or 90,000*l.*, which would bring the entire public provision (including the revenues of the Duchies) up to about three-quarters of a million per annum.

Such are the constituents of the great national subsidy which has now once again to be considered by the House of Commons and

¹ Allowing for the lapse of the annuities to the Duke of Edinburgh (25,000*l.*), and the Princess Mary of Cambridge (5,000*l.*).

the people of this country. In the settlement of a Civil List there often have been disputed questions of great constitutional interest, and this time the situation is unquestionably affected by what took place in 1889. The grant of course proceeds from the House of Commons alone. On the question of the amount to be granted, the appropriation of the grant to specific classes, the abolition or retention of particular payments, the House, as Sir Robert Peel once said, has absolute power to do as it pleases. It will doubtless, in this as in other matters, be guided very much by precedent, and these precedents show that one Civil List Act may differ in very material respects from another. A full account of the history of the Civil List and the hereditary revenues associated therewith is to be found in the voluminous return relating to Public Income and Expenditure presented in 1869, and usually known as Mr. Gladstone's Return.

The Act of 1698 (9 & 10 W. III. c. 23) is usually said to have been the first Civil List Act. A resolution of the House of Commons had previously granted to King William the Third an annual sum not exceeding 700,000*l.* 'for the support of the Civil List,' and the Act which followed specified certain revenues as the funds out of which this sum was to be paid. These were: The Hereditary Revenues of the Crown, the Temporary Excise, and the 'new subsidy' of tonnage and poundage.

The 'Hereditary Revenues' recited in the Act were: the Hereditary Excise, the Hereditary Post Office Duties, and certain miscellaneous items, usually called the small branches of the hereditary revenues, which included the revenue of the Duchy of Cornwall, and 'of other revenues arising by the rent of lands in England and Wales.'

The appropriated revenues are declared to be for the service of the King's household and family and 'other his necessary expenses and occasions.' Any surplus beyond 700,000*l.* was not to be disposed of without the authority of Parliament. A later Act substituted a different arrangement, the sum of 3,700*l.* a week being deducted from the Civil List Fund and applied to the public use and service. Mr. Gladstone's Return contains an Estimate drawn up in 1699 of the charges falling on this Civil List. They include 40,000*l.* for foreign Ministers (Ambassadors, &c.); 80,000*l.* for the salaries of various officials, including the Lord Chancellor, twelve Judges, Masters in Chancery, Secretary of State, Commissioners of Trade, Lecturers at the Universities, &c., and 71,000*l.* for pensions.² The Civil List under the first Act included therefore, in its charges, items belonging to the ordinary civil government of the country, and in the revenues appropriated to it, the income arising out of Crown lands, as well as the proceeds of public taxation. There was no definite

² Including Dr. Titus Oates for life of himself and wife, 300*l.*

line drawn on the one hand between the expenditure of the Court and the cost of the public service; or on the other between the proceeds of taxation and the revenues of hereditary estates.³

The Civil List Act of Anne is of great constitutional importance. It recites the desire of Parliament to settle upon Her Majesty for 'the expenses of Civil Government' as large a revenue as any 'enjoyed for that purpose by any of her royal predecessors,' and accordingly continues the temporary excise and the 'new subsidy' for the Queen's life, and appropriates these proceeds together with the hereditary revenues to the support of her household and 'the honour and dignity of the Crown.' The deduction of 3,700*l.* a week was maintained, and made perpetual out of 'the hereditary excise only.' Other sums were at different times appropriated to public purposes. In this reign the expenditure of the Civil Government in Scotland was brought into account, and we are told that the whole of the hereditary revenues of the Crown in that country were 'applied in paying the salaries of judges and other officers and other charges upon the establishments there, so that no part remained towards the general expenses of Her Majesty's household or the Civil Government of England.' The important section of Queen Anne's Civil List Act dealing with the Crown lands is noticed separately.

The charges on the Civil List appear to have been much the same in character and amount as in the previous reign. In 1703 the total expenditure was 589,000*l.*, and included 24,000*l.* for secret service, nearly 90,000*l.* for fees and salaries, and 40,000*l.* for British Ministers abroad. The total income after the various deductions mentioned above was for the same year 539,051*l.*⁴

In the Civil List Act of George the First, the revenues of the Duchy of Cornwall and certain minor items were excluded from the hereditary revenues appropriated along with others as before 'to the support of His Majesty's household and the honour and dignity of the Crown.' An Act of the second Session granted a further sum of 120,000*l.* out of the 'Aggregate Fund' to the 'Civil List Revenues,' on condition that if the total fell short of 700,000*l.* the deficiency should be made good by Parliament, and any surplus should go to the Aggregate Fund. Further grants were made in different years, and it appears that the income of the King applicable to the support of the household and the expenses of civil government, *i.e.* 700,000*l.*, was inadequate, and additional sums amounting to 1,300,000*l.* were applied to discharge debts which had accrued.⁵

³ 'The general nature of the expenditure in each year was precisely similar, and comprehended every expenditure of the country, except payment on account of the Public Debt, and for the great services of the Army, Navy, and Ordnance, which were defrayed out of other funds provided by Parliament.'—Mr. Gladstone's Return, part II. p. 594.

⁴ Mr. Gladstone's Return, part I. p. 29, and part II. p. 595.

⁵ Return, part II. p. 596.

The Civil List Act of George the Second provided that if the 'Civil List Revenues' failed to yield 800,000*l.* over and above encumbrances, the deficiency should be made good by Parliament, but any surplus should go to the Crown. Subsequent Acts of the same reign affected the Civil List in various ways which need not be enumerated. The average income of the List in George the First's time was 805,000*l.*, and in George the Second's 811,000*l.* As before the charges include large sums for secret service, fees, and salaries, and for the maintenance of British Ministers abroad.

The reign of George the Third marks an important change in the system of the List. The King on his accession signified his consent to the Commons that such disposition might be made of his 'interest in the hereditary revenues of the Crown as might best conduce to the utility and satisfaction of the public.' The duties hitherto payable in support of the Crown, together with the hereditary revenues, were accordingly carried to the Aggregate Fund, and a fixed Civil List revenue of 800,000*l.* was granted to the King out of the Aggregate Fund. The Civil List Act in which all this is enacted contains no terms of compact. The Commons acknowledge that the King's suggestion is 'a most substantial proof of his tender concern for the welfare of his people and that the same is superior in his royal breast to all other considerations.' They express their desire that a certain and competent revenue for defraying the expenses of His Majesty's Civil Government and supporting the dignity of the Crown may be settled on His Majesty for his life. And they proceed to enact accordingly. It is to be observed that in the enumeration of the hereditary revenues which 'had stood settled or appointed to be towards the support of the household of the late King and the honour and dignity of the Crown,' and were now to be paid to the Aggregate Fund, the revenue of the Duchy of Cornwall is expressly excluded. In this Act as in others the object of the Civil List is variously described to be 'the support of the household and the honour and dignity of the Crown,' or 'defraying the charge of the Civil Government and other his necessary expenses and occasions.' The phrases appear to be interchangeable. In point of fact, 'in addition to the personal family and household expenses of the sovereign, nearly the whole expenses of the Civil Government were charged upon the Civil List.'⁶ The amount appropriated became insufficient to meet the increasing expenditure, and relief was obtained from time to time by additional grants and by charging on the Consolidated Fund expenditure that under the old system would have fallen on the Civil List. The Act of 56 Geo. III. c. 46 contains a schedule classifying the charges under various heads, the total being estimated at 1,083,727*l.*

The Civil List Acts of George the Fourth, of William the Fourth,

⁶ Return of 1869, part II. p. 600.

and of Victoria recited the like surrender of the interest of the Sovereign in the hereditary revenues, and contained the like classification of the purposes to which the grant from the Consolidated Fund was to be applied. The second Act, however, was avowedly based on the principle of limiting the charge to expenses affecting the dignity and state of the Crown and the personal comfort of Their Majesties. The grant was cut down from 850,000*l.* to 510,000*l.*; the allowances and salaries to judges, ambassadors and other officials disappear, and the classification adopted was the following :

	<i>£</i>
Class 1. Their Majesties' Privy Purse . . .	110,000
Class 2. Salaries of the Household . . .	130,300
Class 3. Expenses of the Household . . .	171,500
Class 4. Special and Secret Service . . .	23,200
Class 5. Pensions . . .	75,000

The same principle was carried still further in the Act of Victoria, the classification of which has already been set forth.

Finally the new King has in his Speech from the Throne unreservedly placed at the disposal of the House of Commons the hereditary revenues which had been surrendered by his predecessors.

The long series of Statutes dealing with the Civil List—of which the leading Acts alone have been referred to here—exhibit a clearly marked constitutional progress. The Civil List in the earlier Acts is a provision for the 'Civil Government' of the country, including the maintenance of the Court. It leaves the great military services and certain portions of the Civil services to be supplied by Parliamentary grants. It is permanent, in the sense that it is by Act of Parliament made coterminous with the current reign. The Act seizes and applies to its purposes certain so-called hereditary revenues of the Crown and certain specified taxes. That is the first stage. Then in the Act of 1760 the interest of the Sovereign in these hereditary revenues is surrendered, and that surrender is repeated in every subsequent Act. The language of recital and enactment is not uniformly the same. It would be tedious and probably useless to recapitulate the variations. The last Civil List Act contains a recital that the hereditary revenues 'are now due and payable to your Majesty,' and section 2 enacts that 'after the decease of Her Majesty they shall be payable and paid to Her Majesty's heirs and successors.' Finally in the reign of George the Third began the process of shifting the burden of 'Civil Government' properly so-called from the Civil List to the annual grants in Supply and the permanent charges on the Consolidated Fund—a process now almost carried to completion. Little remains, as we have seen, in the Civil List but matters of household and personal expenditure, and the historic term has become a misnomer.

Since the gradual elimination of the public services from the Civil List began there have been from time to time suggestions made

that the 'Crown lands' surrendered at the beginning of each reign furnish some kind of measure of the amount to be allotted to the Civil List. It is sometimes said that they are the personal property of the Sovereign, and that the 'surrender' is a bargain in which the country has had the best of it. The most definite form ever given to this idea by a responsible Minister is to be found in Mr. Disraeli's argument that the Sovereign 'positively relinquished the large real estate which Her Majesty possessed by the laws of the land by as clear a title and as complete possession as any of the peers hold their estates to whom reference has been made,' and that 'the Civil List was a settlement not to the personal advantage of Her Majesty.'

This theory, recent as I believe it to be in origin, is quite inconsistent with the history of the Civil List. It reads into the 'surrender' by the Crown to the country, substituted in the Act of George the Third for the previous grant by Parliament to the Crown, a meaning which that transaction cannot properly bear. What is surrendered is the 'interest' of the Crown, in the 'hereditary revenues.' If Mr. Disraeli's language was correct, such of these revenues as consisted of the proceeds of taxation were equally with the real estate the personal property of the Sovereign. What then was and is the Sovereign's real interest in the Crown lands?

Those who wish to get to the real root of the matter should read John Allen's chapter on the tenure of landed property in his once famous and still valuable book on 'The Royal Prerogative.' A thousand years ago the King of England could, like other people, own land as private property. He could also, with the assent of his Council, but not without, make grants to private persons of the land which belonged to the people. Gradually a different conception came to prevail, the land of the people became the *terra regis*, of which the King might dispose as he pleased, and out of the revenues of which he discharged all the expenditure of his Government. It was his land in the same sense that the servants of the public were his servants, the laws his laws. But during that period the King could not be said to have private property at all.

The distinction between the private patrimony of the King and the public property of the State was at length obliterated. When the folclands of the community which had not been converted into private inheritance acquired the

¹ *Hansard*, the 31st of July, 1871. Less exceptionable is Sir George Cornwall Lewis's statement that 'it has been deemed a matter of policy in this country wholly to strip and denude the Sovereign of all hereditary property, and to render him during his life entirely dependent upon the bounty of Parliament. Through a constitutional jealousy of the ever-increasing power of the Crown, it has been deprived of its hereditary revenues, and a corresponding obligation arises on the part of Parliament to make a sufficient provision for the Crown and the Royal Family.'—*Hansard*, the 22nd of May, 1857.

character and appellation of Crown lands, these two species of property were entirely confounded. It became a maxim of English law that all lands and tenements possessed by the King belong to him in right of his crown, and descend with it to his successor though he had been seized of them in his private capacity before he was king, and had inherited them from ancestors who were never invested with the attributes of royalty. By the adoption of this principle, the King was restrained from making bequests of landed property by will, but he still retained the power of giving away the lands of the Crown in his lifetime, and from erroneous conceptions of his right to these lands he was allowed to dispose of them by patent without the advice and consent of his great council. How much that power was abused it is needless to say.*

The abuse was at last remedied by the Civil List Act of Queen Anne. The fifth section sets forth the true nature of the interest of the Sovereign in the Crown lands in the clearest possible way. It declares that

the necessary expenses of supporting the Crown, or the greatest part of them, were formerly defrayed by a Land Revenue, which hath from time to time been impaired and diminished by the grants of former kings and queens of this realm, so that Her Majesty's Land Revenue at present can afford very little for the support of her Government; nevertheless, from time to time, upon the determination of particular estates, whereupon many reversions and remainders in the Crown do now depend or expect, and by such lands, tenements, and hereditaments as may hereafter descend, escheat or otherwise come to Her Majesty, her heirs or successors, the Land Revenue of the Crown, in fines, rents, and other profits thereof may hereafter be increased, and consequently the burthen upon the estates of the subjects of this realm may be eased and lessened in all future provisions to be made for the expenses of the Civil Government.

The section after this preamble goes on to restrain the alienation by the Crown of any manors, messuages, lands, tenements, rents, tithes, woods, or other hereditaments 'now belonging or hereafter to belong to Her Majesty, her heirs or successors, or to any other person in trust for Her Majesty, her heirs or successors, in possession reversion remainder use or expectancy, whether the same be or shall be in right of the Crown of England, or as part of the Principality of Wales or of the Duchy or County Palatine of Lancaster, or otherwise howsoever.'

This comprehensive enactment includes in its sweep the true private property of the Sovereign for the time being. It was not until 1800 that this anomaly—as it had now become—was removed. By a statute of that year it is enacted that none of the restrictions or provisions in the Act of Anne shall apply to any landed property

* The greater part of the estates of the Crown had, indeed, been sold or purposely given away before the close of the seventeenth century. Even at the time of the Revolution the Crown lands were considered to be of so little value that, in the debate in the House of Commons upon the settlement of the revenue of King William and Queen Mary it was said, 'The revenue of the Crown lands is all gone; it is aliened from the King; he can have nothing from his land but from Parliament.' At the close of King William's reign the net revenue of the Crown lands was estimated at 6,000*l.* a year only, exclusive of the revenue of the Duchy of Cornwall, which was estimated at 9,000*l.* a year.—Mr. Gladstone's Return, part II. p. 433.

purchased by the King or his successors out of moneys from the privy purse, or other moneys not appointed to any public service, or coming to him or them 'from any person or persons not being kings or queens of this realm.'⁹

The combined effect of the various Civil List Acts and this Act is, according to Mr. Allen, virtually to restore to the public the Crown lands, and to the Sovereign the power of acquiring landed property of his own. The historians, including Mr. Freeman, perhaps lay too much stress on this aspect of the 'surrender.' The public character of the Crown lands is even more emphatically asserted in the appropriation of them to the purposes of Civil Government by the earlier Acts, and in the unequivocal language of the Statute of Anne. The true conclusion appears to me to be best stated in the words of a writer the weight of whose opinion would be at once recognised if I were to mention his name :

It is a fallacy that the Crown lands are in some peculiar sense the private property of the Sovereign, and that their revenues constitute a fund chargeable only with his personal expenditure, and that of the Royal Family. The title of the Crown to the Crown lands is indisputable, but it is only entitled to them subject to the somewhat onerous obligation of defraying the whole of the ordinary expenditure of the State.

They once constituted the fund out of which almost the whole of the expenditure of the State was defrayed, and they are now held by the same title and subject to the same obligations as they were then.

The arrangement made at the beginning of every reign is really an integral part of the Constitution, and could not be abandoned.

The reversionary interest of the heir to the Crown is saddled with an annual burden of some seventy millions ; it is therefore practically valueless, and may be disregarded.

We have seen that the Duchy of Cornwall was expressly exempted from some of the Civil List Acts. Doubts appear to have arisen whether the 'surrender' by William the Fourth, which embraced hereditary and casual revenues, included the revenues of the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster, but it was distinctly stated in the House of Commons that it did not. 'The revenues of Cornwall never were the property of the Crown except when there was no heir apparent to the Throne, and the revenues of Lancaster had been from a very early period subject to peculiar regulations, totally independent of the authority of the Sovereign.'¹⁰ Attempts have been made from time to time to subject these revenues to the same control as the 'surrendered' revenues. In 1780 Mr. Burke proposed to take them over for the public service in exchange for a clear annuity to the Crown based on their average value for a period of twenty years. Parliament, however, has been content with enacting, as it did in 1837, that accounts of the income and expenditure of the two Duchies should be laid before it every year. The papers for

⁹ 39 & 40 Geo. III. c. 88.

¹⁰ Return of 1860, part II. p. 605.

1899 show that Lancaster in that year paid 60,000*l.* to the Queen, and Cornwall 66,915*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.* to the Prince of Wales. It may be added that the charges on the Duchy of Lancaster include the salary of the Chancellor, who is of course a member of the Government of the day. These 'Crown lands' accordingly occupy an anomalous position, due, or at least attributed to the peculiarity of the title. They form no part of the revenues which, according to Mr. Freeman, 'a custom as strong as law' has compelled the King to give back to the nation. On the other hand, they are no more than the Crown lands the private property of the Sovereign or the Heir Apparent, although that contention also has from time to time been maintained.

The true private estates of the Sovereign are governed by a series of Acts of Parliament of their own. These are really enabling Acts, permitting the King to escape from the disabilities of his common-law and statutory position and to acquire, own, and dispose of landed property in his own personal right. The Act of 1800 was the first, but by no means the last. An Act of 1862 defines the 'private estates' of the Sovereign (in terms which effectually exclude anything in the nature of Crown lands), and in respect of these seeks to give the Sovereign the ordinary rights of a private owner. But as recently as 1873 it was necessary to pass another Act in order to make it quite clear that if the Queen were to leave Balmoral to the Prince of Wales, the estate would not, on his accession to the Throne, fall into the grip of the Statute of Anne and become Crown land in the ordinary sense of the term. And it was not without difficulty that the emancipation was effected. Constitutionalists like Mr. Bouverie resisted it on the familiar ground that the private wealth of the Sovereign should not be increased—that he should be, as in times past, dependent on the bounty of Parliament.

The now expiring Act of 1889 was based upon the report of a Committee of the House of Commons which, reciting that Her Majesty did not then press for any pensions for the children of her daughters and younger sons, recorded its opinion that 'with regard to the daughters and younger sons of future sovereigns, at the proper time arrangements should be made under which no future claims of a similar kind can arise.' They accordingly recommended the grant of 36,000*l.* a year to the Prince of Wales 'in order to prevent repeated applications to Parliament and to establish the principle that the provision for children should hereafter be made out of grants adequate to that purpose which have been assigned to their parents.' These words are recited in the preamble of the Act, and it is hardly possible that the new Civil List can be settled without reference to them. Of course the present Parliament is not bound by the enactments of a preceding Parliament, still less by the findings or the recommendations of a Select Committee. *But

Parliament did profess in 1889 to create a precedent, and it is to be regretted that the debates of that time do not more clearly elucidate its precise intentions. Mr. Gladstone, however, had no doubt about the practical effect of the words in question.

In my opinion [he said] the question of the grandchildren of the reigning Sovereign, other than the children of the Heir Apparent, is settled—I think for all time—I admit not by a formal withdrawal. I give a most confident opinion, founded upon such observation of public affairs as has ever been within my power, that this claim has as completely disappeared from the region of what may be termed practical politics, as if it had been withdrawn by a deed upon parchment regularly stamped and sealed. What is now asked for undeniably secures us from controversy during the remainder of the reign, and, on the other hand, as undeniably points to the construction of a new Civil List as the occasion when the whole question must be settled in principle and in practice, and likewise indicates that mode of settlement which will be recognised as sound and just.

On the other hand, the proposals of the Select Committee were resisted by other members on the ground that they left alive, if indeed they did not confirm, the claim which Mr. Gladstone considered to be barred.

In this paper, little or nothing has been said of the Civil List and the hereditary revenues of Ireland and Scotland, as they were before these countries became incorporated in the United Kingdom. Nor have I attempted to anticipate the terms of the new settlement the House of Commons is about to make. My object has been to bring together those points in the history of a very curious part of our constitutional system which seem to have the most direct bearing on the immediate question of the hour. For this purpose it has appeared to me that the line of English settlements, beginning with the Act of William the Third, supplied sufficient material. There is now only one Civil List for the United Kingdom. The 'hereditary revenues,' from whatever quarter of the Kingdom they arise, go into the Consolidated Fund, and out of that fund comes the provision for the maintenance of the Crown and the Royal Family. That simple fact seems to me to dispose of the subtleties that have come to the surface in previous controversies, and to leave before the House of Commons and the country the simple question what allowance it befits the country to offer to the King, and to what purposes that allowance should be applied. I am unwilling to add to the few suggestions I have made, but I cannot help observing that the question would become simpler still if the House of Commons were to abandon the system of classification, and allow the King to administer his household allowance as he may think best.

EDMUND ROBERTSON.

CHURCH REFORM.

WHY NOT BEGIN WITH THE PARISH?

OWING to various causes which it is not necessary to investigate or dwell upon in this article, the Church of England has of late years been allowed to drift in a somewhat absent-minded manner, so far as the majority of Church people are concerned, into a condition which can hardly fail to cause anxiety to her best friends, and might very easily become dangerous to her as the Established Church of the Realm.

In venturing to emphasise this danger I hope I may be understood to do so in a dispassionate spirit. I am not one of those who make a fetich of Establishment, as some Anglican Churchmen seem to do.

Both historical and contemporary experience have abundantly proved that political establishment is not of necessity and under all circumstances the arrangement by means of which a church can most effectively fulfil her moral and spiritual mission. The value of such establishment, compared with freedom, should be estimated on its merits in the case of each particular national church, and by the nation itself.

But this question is one that involves so many grave and far-reaching issues in an historic Church like ours that when those who, if a frontal attack were made on her position as an Establishment, would immediately close their ranks and fight for it as for hearth and home, and would even clamorously denounce the attack as sacrilegious—when such persons are seen to be bringing her into imminent danger by the policy they support, or encourage, or acquiesce in, the pity of it can hardly fail to stir us to utter a note of warning.

I may be told that, if this drifting into such dangerous waters has been really going on, the persons chiefly to blame for it are the rulers of the Church, the appointed guardians and stewards of her position and privileges; and I do not venture to affirm that the bishops are, or have been, above criticism in the matter; but even if it can be shown that they might have been wiser or stronger, more

active, or more foreseeing, this in no way lessens the personal responsibility of Churchmen of every degree. It may, however, be safely alleged on behalf of the Diocesan Bishops that no one who has dispassionately observed their utterances and their action as a body during the last two years can doubt their desire to maintain and hand on our Reformed Church with its Evangelical, Catholic, and comprehensive character unimpaired.

Having this desire, they may fairly claim the assured support of the main body of lay Churchmen; and my plea is that the duty devolves on all classes to do their own share of what is requisite for the general well-being of the Church, so that laymen are without excuse if they are content simply to blame the bishops while doing little or nothing on their own account.

It is with this feeling I am venturing to urge on those who profess to value our Church, and who desire to maintain it as they have inherited it, that they should give their personal support to a sound and conciliatory measure of practical reform, which would, if carried, put our Church life in every parish on a constitutional footing."

My reason for wishing to begin with the parish is a very obvious one. It is in the parish that the shoe pinches whenever a difference arises, and the root of parochial differences in nine cases out of ten is found to lie in the arbitrary position of an incumbent and in the fact that the lay parishioners are virtually helpless and without a voice in regard to the worship of their own parish church, mere outlanders, so to speak, expected to contribute resources, but with no voice in the government.

To leave an educated laity for an indefinite period in this anomalous position, accustomed as they are to local self-government in all other matters, is not only to court disaster, but to deserve it.

To withhold from parishioners an adequate share of power and influence in the affairs of their parish church and in regard to the worship provided expressly for their benefit, fosters in some men a feeling of annoyance and dissatisfaction towards the Church, while in others it produces religious indifference, in either case a deplorable result.

If, therefore, we are to deal with this matter so as to nurse and strengthen the attachment of the laity to the Church, instead of gradually alienating large numbers of them in one parish and another, we must agree to begin our reforms with the acceptance of this fundamental postulate, that no measure of reform in Church affairs—be it self-government by Convocation or any other new device—will bring practical relief or equitable conditions of Church life, if it does not first of all settle the relations of an incumbent and his lay parishioners on a reasonable and constitutional basis.

Freedom or self-government, to be worth anything, must begin at home for every one of us. Otherwise it is but a *nomini's umbra*,

and has no reality for us. To be real it must be exercised within the circle of our own life, and this is why our first Church reform should be to place every incumbent in a constitutional position.

At present his legal position is practically that of an arbitrary despot, and it reflects no small credit on the mass of our parochial clergy and their prevailing good sense that a position so arbitrary is, comparatively speaking, so seldom abused. None the less it is in the highest degree expedient that the incumbent of a parish should be transformed into a constitutional minister and steward of spiritual things.

This primary requisite needs to be very distinctly kept in view and persistently emphasised, because reformers who would have us fix our attention on the gift of new powers to Convocation, or on the constitution of ecclesiastical courts, are apt to overlook this most important consideration of self-government in the parish, which once established on a sound basis would go far to leave the courts without litigants, a consummation devoutly to be wished.

The desire of a serious and thoughtful Churchman, who has been nursed and brought up in the atmosphere of constitutional freedom, for a due share or voice in the regulation of his parochial worship, as of other parts of his social life, is a natural and inextinguishable desire.

Preclude him from this, and large questions about ecclesiastical courts and Houses of Convocation have little or no interest for him. All things in our life, he would say to us, are in fact estimated by their value to the individual within the circle of his own affections, desires, hopes, and daily associations.

Therefore, I repeat, we shall do well and wisely to begin our Church reforms with the parish, which is the unit of our Church organisation and the scene of the Church's failure or success, her unity or her unhappy divisions.

Possibly it may be objected that this is to make our Church government too congregational; but to such an objection it may fairly be replied that within the limits of the law, and subject to episcopal authority, this congregational elasticity is just what is needed, not only for the general peace of the Church, but still more to give the freedom which is necessary for efficiency and progress in spiritual work, to maintain her comprehensive character, and to save her from the spirit of indifference among her lay members.

Consequently, that which presents itself to a practical mind as the first and most desirable of Church reforms is the establishment of a representative Church Council in every parish or ecclesiastical district, to be elected by those parishioners who are duly qualified to vote for such a purpose.

As the success of such a reform must inevitably depend on the constitutional powers of the Council, it becomes necessary at this point to consider these in some detail, and a dispassionate consideration of the matter would seem to lead to the conclusion that

the Act of Parliament embodying it should be based on certain fundamental propositions such as the following :

(1) It shall not be lawful for an incumbent or curate in charge of a parish to introduce any changes in the mode of conducting public worship without giving due notice and obtaining the assent of his Church Council.

If this assent is withheld, the clerk may appeal to the Bishop for his decision on the subject, and the Bishop after conference with the clerk and the Council, and after full and careful consideration of the matter, shall make an order embodying his decision.

(2) If the Council desires any reasonable and lawful change to be made in regard to the conduct of public worship, and the incumbent or curate in charge declines to make it, the Council may appeal to the Bishop, who shall, after full and careful consideration of the matter, make an order embodying his decision.

(3) If in any case the Bishop's order is objected to by either party, an appeal shall be allowed to the Archbishop, whose decision shall be final.

(4) If during a vacancy the parishioners through the Church Council petition the Bishop with reference to the mode of conducting public worship which the parishioners desire, it shall be the duty of the Bishop to make an order on the subject, having due regard to the wishes of the parishioners, and this order shall be binding on the new incumbent.

(5) Any clerk who shall disregard an order of the Bishop or Archbishop given under this Act shall be forthwith admonished by the Bishop.

If he fails to obey the admonition within three months, this failure shall *ipso facto* involve the immediate voidance of his benefice, or the lapse of his licence, as the case may be.

(6) Every parishioner duly qualified to vote under the Parish Councils Act, and claiming to be a member of the Church of England as by law established, shall be qualified to vote in the election of the Parish Council, but no other person shall be so qualified.

Every such parishioner (but no other person) shall be qualified to serve on the Council, provided that he attends or desires to attend the church as his habitual place of religious worship, but not otherwise.

In a parish which is divided into districts with separate churches only parishioners resident in the district for which a particular church is provided shall be qualified to vote or serve in connection with the Council of that church.

Of the above proposals, the one on which the whole scheme may be said to hinge, and which may naturally be expected to raise the keenest controversy, is the definition of a parishioner qualified to vote or to serve under such an Act.

Some of the most earnest reformers would claim to define such

parishioners by imposing the communicant's test as the qualification either to vote for a councillor or to serve in that capacity; but while we should desire to see every Christian a communicant, and every church council made up of *bonâ fide* members of the congregation, I anticipate that any experienced statesman would dismiss this proposal as impracticable. It may be taken to be beyond question that so long as the Church is maintained as the National Church a new Test Act of this character will never be sanctioned. Moreover, it will be generally felt that in the interests of the true religious life any such test would be most undesirable. The more we value and reverence the service of the Eucharist the more careful we should be to preserve it from all risk of the taint which such an enactment might bring in its train.

Others would require from every one who claimed to be on the roll of voters a declaration that he is a *bonâ fide* member of the Church of England. This is certainly less objectionable than the previous proposal, but it is open to at least two weighty objections. It could hardly fail to have the effect of narrowing the Church by shutting out of it many of the most conscientious of those who desire to remain in it, thus seriously interfering with its national character; and it would inevitably give rise to frequent recrimination as men took upon themselves to define what is and what is not *bonâ fide* membership.

The true wisdom in this matter, as I would earnestly submit to all who care for the welfare of Church and nation, is to take care that nothing be done by means of any narrowing definition which will have the effect of destroying the national character of the Church or drive any baptised person into the position of an outlander or nonconformist.

Let us hold on to the theory that every such person is a member of the Church until and unless he deliberately cuts himself off from it by his own overt act.

If the comprehensive character of the Church for which even the ritualist is now pleading, and the national character which we all desire to safeguard, are to be maintained, we must jealously hold on to the broad and liberal view of membership which has hitherto been the accepted view.

The Church of England, claiming, as she does, to be the nursing mother of the spiritual life of the nation, will, I trust, always continue to hold fast the duty of cherishing in her wide embrace every Christian man or woman who claims in turn to be one of her children.

Such in brief outline is the reform I respectfully put forward as deserving to be taken in hand first of all, a reform which from the practical point of view is the one most urgently needed, would be most easily carried out, and would be most likely to produce beneficial results.

As regards urgency there can, I think, be little doubt in the minds of those who have closely watched the feeling or temper that has been gathering strength among laymen during the last three or four years.

Looking to other proposals, I desire to be understood as not in any way disparaging such endeavours. On the contrary, I welcome them for criticism or support according to their deserts.

A church which is alive cannot remain unchanging and unprogressive in a world of new thought and new conditions; but in the process of inevitable change I would claim it as the part of practical wisdom, or, let us say, of common-sense statesmanship, applied to Church affairs, to begin with such measures of local self-government as I have indicated.

Thus my claim is simply for precedence, and therefore it is not necessary to enter on any detailed criticism of measures which are being brought forward in other quarters, or from other points of view.

Two such measures are just at present attracting a large amount of attention, and both of them may be said to have come within the range of practical politics: the Discipline Bill, which has met with much favour in the north of England, and the Convocations Bill, which is publicly supported by a large and estimable body of men.

Both of these measures, when considered as practical and healing measures of reform (and none but healing measures deserve our support), seem to be open to some very grave objections.

If the Discipline Bill were passed into law as it stands, I fear it would be bitterly resented by those against whose practices and tendencies it would mainly operate, and might attract such an amount of sympathy to their side as to split the Church into two camps bitterly opposed to each other and engaged in internecine warfare.

Thus, however reasonable its main conditions may seem to the ordinary English mind, to apply them for the healing of our divisions would be, as Horace might have said, *ignem gladio scrutari*, not to turn spears into pruning hooks, but to stir the fire with a sword.

Consequently to the supporters of this Bill I would venture to urge that I have indicated a more excellent way. As regards the Convocations Bill it is reasonable to point out that it is surely a mistake in the present condition of English life, education, and sentiment, to endeavour in any way to revert to a more clerical form of Church government, or even to seem to desire to subordinate the government of the Church to a predominant clerical influence, so that this Bill needs to be drawn on different lines.

Moreover, it is hardly to be expected that the English Parliament will by its own act leave the definition of an English lay Churchman, the franchise he is to enjoy, or the powers he is to exercise in Church

affairs, to be formulated by an unreformed clerical convocation, while reserving to itself merely the opportunity of saying yes or no, once for all, to any scheme of Church membership and government which this Convocation might propose to it.

Under these circumstances our reformers of Convocation might do well to consider the wisdom of endeavouring first of all to arrive at a distinct understanding as to the position and powers of laymen in the counsels of an autonomous Church, which would be accepted by the Houses of Parliament. And, seeing that the true method in all reform is to effect the required improvements with the minimum of change or friction, might it not be a sound and wise policy to propose at the outset that the lay assembly in the Church's Parliament or Convocation shall consist of all those lay members of the House of Lords and all those members of the House of Commons who claim to be members of the Church of England as by law established?

But my primary objection to our relying on these two measures as healing measures for immediate application is that they cannot be got ready for immediate and healing use.

Assuming their virtues to be all that their respective supporters believe them to be, what hope is there of applying them in time to give the patient the desired relief? To such a question there can, as I venture to think, be only one answer. There is very little prospect of passing either of these measures and putting it into successful operation without a long and bitter conflict, and even possibly a conflict that might involve some trouble to governments.

Can the Church afford to wait for the issue of such conflicts in the political arena, and to risk the dangers involved in them? My plea is, that, all the signs of the times being duly considered, such waiting might prove too perilous.

It is conceivable that masterly inactivity, or debates in Parliament and Convocation long drawn out, might represent a wise policy, if we were safely entrenched on *terra firma*; but for those who are afloat in a vessel amid strong currents which might all too easily sweep it in the direction of a cataract, to persist in sitting with folded hands, or spend all their energies on interminable disputes, is suggestive of that spirit of blindness or over-confidence which is close akin to infatuation.

Looking, then, to the present circumstances of our Church, her needs and her dangers, I put it forward with all respect as my firm conviction that any influential body of Churchmen who would throw the weight of their influence into a united effort to carry with as little delay as possible such a measure of reform as I have here indicated, would be doing a great deal to save us from some grave and threatening perils, and would deserve the gratitude of both Church and Nation.

J. HEREFORD.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN HOSPITALS COMMISSION

THE elaborate report of the Royal Commission upon 'the care and treatment of the sick and wounded during the South African campaign' resolves itself into two distinct divisions. The one of these is concerned with an inquiry into the many serious complaints made as to the care of the sick and wounded, and the other with recommendations for the remedying of certain defects in the Army medical service.

The body of the report will be read with considerable relief, and with a degree of satisfaction. The inquiry undertaken by the Commission has been arduous and far-reaching, has involved the handling of an immense mass of evidence, and the investigation of charges which have lacked little in the way of either variety or virulence.

It is satisfactory to find that the graver of the charges made have proved to be either exaggerated or unfounded, and that the medical service of the Army can claim to rise from the ordeal with distinct credit.

The findings of the Commission will carry with them conviction, for it is abundantly evident that the inquiry has been conducted with infinite patience, with thoroughness, with impartiality, and with admirable judgment.

The general result of the investigation is summed up in the concluding passage of the Report, and in the following words :

We desire to say that, in our judgment, reviewing the campaign as a whole, it has not been one where it can properly be said that the medical and hospital arrangements have broken down. There has been nothing in the nature of a scandal with regard to the care of the sick and wounded ; no general or widespread neglect of patients, no indifference to their suffering. And all witnesses of experience in other wars are practically unanimous in the view that, taking it all in all, in no campaign have the sick and wounded been *so* well looked after as they have been in this.

The more detailed analysis of the evidence makes it clear that the strain thrown upon the Army medical service was very severe, and that on occasion the demands were so sudden and excessive that they could not be satisfactorily met by the department. Those who read the report cannot fail to find themselves more in sympathy with the Royal Army Medical Corps, for the matter-of-fact account which is given shows vividly the immense difficulties the department had to face, and furnishes details as to the overpowering crowd of sick

and wounded who flocked to the hospital tents. The report itself is sympathetic; and it is apparent from many of the comments made that the Commissioners fully appreciate the hard case of the worried and overworked medical officer who had to deal with emergencies which no forethought could have anticipated, had to wait always upon the fortunes of an overburdened transport, and had constantly to attempt the problem of 'making bricks without straw.' The report, moreover, brings forcibly into notice the fact that in war there is cast upon the sick and wounded an immense amount of needless suffering and misery. The fact is lamentable enough, and the Commissioners are compelled to acknowledge that no little of this distress would seem to be unavoidable and beyond remedy. In this admission there is no attempt to hide incompetency and unpreparedness under the platitude that 'war is war,' nor are the results of inefficiency improperly shielded by the general cloak of the 'horrors of war.' Speaking of the state of the wounded in the advance to Kimberley, the Commissioners have to own that 'the suffering occasioned was part of the price that had to be paid for success in the campaign.' Over and over again in the report this remark is re-echoed.

The finding of the Commissioners upon the very numerous complaints brought before them need not be discussed in this place; but the following incidental matters in the substance of the report are of some importance and interest. The number of individuals under the control of the Army Medical Department may be gathered from the following paragraph: 'At the time of the greatest pressure, which occurred at the end of the month of March, the total force then engaged being about 207,000 men, there were about 800 medical officers (including civil surgeons), 6,000 hospital subordinates, and 800 nurses in the country.'

The Commissioners' opinion of the Royal Army Medical Corps and the civil surgeons is thus expressed:

Like every large body of men, the Royal Army Medical Corps has its unfit or bad members, but the evidence justifies us in saying that, in this war, the proportion of such members to the whole body of the Royal Army Medical Corps is very small. Speaking of the officers as a whole, their conduct and capacity deserve great praise. Their devotion to their duties, both at the front and in the fixed hospitals, and the unselfish way in which they have attended to the sick and wounded, often at the risk of life, have been recognised by all impartial witnesses. The civil surgeons employed in this campaign have, as a body, done their duty extremely well. But few complaints have been made against any of them, and such complaints as have been made are not of a grave character. As a rule, the civil surgeons worked well with the officers of the Army Medical Department.

The much-abused orderlies are commented upon in these words:

Many orderlies displayed great devotion towards their patients and lost their lives in the faithful discharge of their work. The complaints against the orderlies are no doubt due, to a great extent, to the fact that the supply of trained men of

the Army Medical Corps was greatly insufficient for the war, and that orderlies not properly trained or constituted for the work had to be supplied. . . . Some orderlies have been inattentive and some rough, others have occasionally been intoxicated, and a few are even said to have been brutal to their patients.

Of the nurses they speak highly, and point out that 'there was no difficulty found in obtaining a sufficient number of suitable persons, nearly all of whom were properly trained.'

A very detailed account is given of the work of the medical department on the various lines of advance, and the description is sufficiently ample to enable the casual reader to form an opinion of the difficulties to be faced and of the manner in which they were met. It is, perhaps, needless to say that the Commissioners are not entirely satisfied with the condition of medical affairs as laid bare by the evidence they collected. They have found certain complaints to be well founded. They draw attention to 'mistakes and oversights on the part of the responsible authorities.' And they conclude their report, as already stated, by discussing 'what steps ought to be taken with a view of remedying the evils they have noticed,' and they add that 'those evils were serious and ought not to be minimised.'

This brings us to the second division of the report—to the suggestions made with a view of remedying defects. To this portion of the report the greatest interest must attach. That there is much to be put right in the administration of the medical service admits of no question, and the most enthusiastic admirer of the Royal Army Medical Corps must confess that the department is not only capable of improvement, but is in great need of it. That part of the report which deals with the remedying of defects will be perused by many with no little disappointment. The recommendations are few and indefinite, and will, I think, hardly satisfy those who are tolerant of some reform on the one hand, or eager for a large measure of change on the other. It is only fair, however, to state that the terms of the appointment of the Commission did not go beyond the order 'to consider and report upon the care and treatment of the sick and wounded during the South African campaign.'

Minor recommendations of the Commissioners deal with the improvement of the existing ambulance waggon, the selection of hospital tents, the control of the Royal Army Medical Corps in the matter of supplies, and with administrative details of a comparatively unimportant nature. The principal suggestions come under the following heads:

- (1) The establishment of the staff of officers and orderlies of the Royal Army Medical Corps and its equipment on a scale sufficient to enable it to discharge adequately the duties ordinarily cast upon it in times of peace, and by the smaller wars in which the Empire, by its vast extent, is so frequently engaged.

- (2) Regulations and provisions which will enable surgeons and trained orderlies in sufficient numbers to be rapidly obtained and added to the ordinary staff of the Royal Army Medical Corps in the event of a great war, and that will also ensure

a rapid supply of all hospital and other equipment required for the due care of the sick and wounded in such a war.

(3) The attraction to the Royal Army Medical Corps of a sufficient and regular supply of officers of good professional attainments, and the improvement of the position of the officers by the allowance of sufficient holidays, and by provisions enabling them to become adequately acquainted with the advancements in medical and surgical science, and the necessity of employing in the higher posts men selected for their merits rather than by seniority.

(4) The employment, to a greater extent than that recognised and practised until the later stages of this war, of nurses in fixed hospitals for the care of the wounded and of fever and dysenteric patients, and such others as can properly be nursed by females.

(5) The appointment of properly qualified officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps to undertake sanitary duties.

Before, however, such questions as these can be discussed it is essential that the position of the Army Medical Department in the scheme of the Army should be more satisfactorily defined. The reading of the body of the report would make it appear that the time has come when the medical service should occupy a far more prominent position as a detail of the Army than it at present holds. In the prosecution of a war the primary object is, without doubt, to effect the purpose upon which the institution of the war was based; and it is equally obvious that the secondary object is to effect that end with as little loss of life to the forces concerned as is possible. This war, like others, has shown that, in a long campaign, the loss of life from disease is unfortunately greater than is the loss from wounds; and when it is recognised that the larger proportion of these deaths from disease are due to what are termed preventable affections, the importance of the medical department of an army becomes very strongly emphasised. There is a disposition—due in some degree to the subordinate position occupied by the medical service—to consider that war is represented only by attacks on trenches and gun positions, and to disregard strongholds and ambuscades of dysentery and fever.

In the returns of the present war, as published at the end of January, the following figures are to be noticed:

TOTAL REPORT UP TO, AND INCLUDING, THE MONTH OF JANUARY

	Officers	N.O.O.'s and men
Killed in action	334	3,346
Died of wounds	103	1,081
Prisoners who have died in captivity	4	92
Died of disease	188	7,605
Accidental deaths	6	230
Total deaths in South Africa	635	12,354
Missing and prisoners (excluding those who have been recovered or have died in captivity)	15	922
Sent home as invalids	1,703	39,095
Total South African Field Force	2,353	52,371

54,724

In the face of these facts it may be not out of place to urge that the Director-General of the Army Medical Department should have a recognised position in the supreme councils which direct the administration of the Army; and that his representatives in the field should have such position on the Staff as would enable the medical aspects of the campaign to be effectively brought into notice. On the other hand, however, it cannot for a moment be said that the medical service has been in any way neglected by the generals in command in the present campaign. The report alone contains repeated evidence—if such were needed—of the constant and anxious regard Lord Roberts and those under his command had for the care of the sick in the hospitals; and, so far as the Natal part of the campaign is concerned, I can speak with gratitude of the continued and most solicitous interest which General Buller took in all matters connected with the sick and wounded, and of his eagerness to make perfect in every way the work of the medical department.

The recommendations of the Commissioners may now be considered in detail.

The first and third of these suggestions deal with the well-known fact that the Army Medical Corps is much below its necessary strength. The Director-General says in his evidence 'that the strength of the Army Medical Corps, both in officers and men, was completely exhausted in providing medical attendance for the first two army corps in South Africa.'

The Royal Army Medical Corps [says the report] was wholly insufficient in Staff and equipment for such a war, and it was not so constituted as to have means provided by which its Staff could be very materially enlarged or its deficiencies promptly made good. The deficiency in the staff of the Royal Army Medical Corps before this war was not the fault of the Director-General and the Staff of officers associated with him. They had, for a considerable time before the outbreak, urged upon the military authorities the necessity for an increase of the corps, but for the most part without avail.

It is, indeed, a fact that the paucity of candidates for the Royal Army Medical Service is such that vacant commissions cannot be filled up; and it is a further fact that the service has been for years seriously undermanned. Here, then, in spite of the undoubted popularity of the Army, in spite of the attractions of a military career, in spite of the fact that the medical profession is said to be overcrowded, or at least very amply stocked, candidates cannot be found to come forward for service in the Royal Army Medical Corps.

When this question was discussed some years ago, it was considered that the lack of a military rank explained the unpopularity of the service. This rank was granted, and the medical service was embodied as a Royal corps. In spite of a few opinions to the contrary, it would appear that this granting of military rank to

Army surgeons has been a wise and just movement, has been cordially appreciated, and has been the means of rendering more efficient the working of the department. Yet, notwithstanding this discreet action on the part of the Minister for War, the corps remains about as it was, still unattractive and undermanned.

The following appear to me to be the chief reasons why the Army Medical Corps fails to obtain 'a sufficient and regular supply of officers of good professional attainments':

(1) In the first place, the pay (or the allowance which is equivalent to pay) is not adequate. Subjoined is the present scale of pay, and it may seem to be ample enough until the expenses of living are inquired into. The gratuities and pensions may be said to be liberal, but it is to the initial scale of pay that most objection is taken.

SCALE OF PAY IN ANNUAL AMOUNTS

		Per Annum		
		£	£	s. d.
•	Lieutenants and Captains	200 to 273	15	0
	Majors	365 to 410	12	6
•	Lieut.-Colonels	456 to 601	15	0
	Colonels		730	0 0
	Surgeon-Generals		1,003	15 0

Exclusive of quarters, fuel, servants, &c., or allowances in lieu.

GRATUITIES AND PENSIONS

		£
After 10 years' service, gratuity of		1,250
" 15 " "		1,800
" 18 " "		2,500
" 20 " annual pension of		365
" 25 " "	£410 to 500	
Colonels after 3 years' service as such, about		640
Surgeon-Generals after 3 years' service as such		730

The warrant upon which this scale was founded dates from some years ago—from a time, at least, before the employment of unqualified assistants in medical practice was declared to be illegal. The assistant to the medical practitioner has now to be qualified, and the result is that the demand for young qualified men has greatly increased and the rate of remuneration has reached, in consequence, a high scale. The pay of the Army medical service is, in fact, based upon an obsolete market.

(2) The undermanning of the Service gives rise to serious complaints as regards holiday leave, leave for purposes of study, length of foreign service, and the like. These grievances are recognised as genuine. They have been very frequently emphasised in the medical journals, and they are specially enumerated in the present report.

(3) The amount of non-professional work thrown upon the Army

surgeon is considerable, and is very irksome to men who are anxious to practise their profession and to make advance in it.

In the present campaign the officers of the Royal Army Medical Corps, in some of the larger stationary hospitals, were kept constantly occupied with what may be termed office-work, the writing of reports and returns, and the checking of lists of supplies, &c. They were entirely prevented in several instances from attending upon the sick and wounded, that duty being undertaken by civil surgeons. This purely clerical work is a serious burden. It helps to extinguish interest in professional affairs, it does nothing to make an officer a more efficient surgeon, and it is from a business point of view exceedingly extravagant. The services of a specially qualified man are demanded and are paid for at a special scale, and yet when he enters the field of his work, he as often as not finds himself engrossed with petty concerns which could be as well or better disposed of by an ordinary clerk. It would seem anomalous if the senior surgeon of a civil hospital should be answerable for all reports and returns of patients, and should have to concern himself with supplies and with all details connected with stores, stretchers, blankets, utensils, and the like. In a civil hospital such work falls to the lot of a house governor or a house steward, and the surgeon is free to follow his special calling. In a military hospital in the field all this non-professional work should be in the hands of a quartermaster, whose responsibilities and duties should be so extended beyond their present narrow limit as to enable him to entirely relieve the commanding medical officer from this irksome and quite unsuitable work.

The Commissioners in their minor suggestions ask 'Whether the administrative and clerical duties of the Principal Medical Officers can be lightened; and, in particular, to what extent the reports and returns which have to be made can and should be shortened?'

(4) The Army medical service offers very little encouragement for advancement in professional work. It must be assumed that the majority of those who enter the profession of medicine do so because that particular occupation interests them. It cannot be denied that the Army medical service does little to foster this interest and still less to encourage a continued advancement in purely professional work. When once a young surgeon has obtained his commission he need trouble himself but little about medicine and surgery. He will be advanced to the position of a colonel if he lives long enough and behaves decently, but his advancement will be rather by years of service than by professional merit. The Service encourages its officers to live long and give no offence, but it does very little to help them to progress in their profession and to become more able surgeons and physicians, and, as a consequence, more able officers. Promotion, indeed, in the Service should be by professional merit rather than by years. The Commissioners allude to this when they

urge 'the necessity of employing in the higher posts men selected for their merit rather than by seniority.'

To go more into detail it may first be noted that the entrance examination of the Army medical service is not popular, nor is it of notable utility. It deals—as regards its compulsory subjects—with the same topics of examination as form part of the usual tests for a qualifying degree or diploma. The recently qualified candidate has just had his knowledge satisfactorily tested in these subjects, and he is not impressed with the need of going over the same ground again merely for the purpose of being ranged in a list. The optional subjects—which embrace modern languages, physics, zoology, geology, and botany—do not appear to be particularly germane to his future career, except perhaps as regards the first-named item.

It would be of greater value to the candidate and to the Service he is joining if the entrance examination were to concern itself with such subjects as tropical diseases, gunshot wounds, hygiene, camp sanitation, and the like, and possibly also with modern languages. The candidate has already shown himself qualified to practise, and is probably not a little weary of five years' study in the subjects required by the qualifying examinations. The subjects just detailed open up new fields and new interests, and are of direct service in the future; and as the entrance examination has little real object beyond that of being a means of classifying competitors, it is well that it should be as practical as possible.

The successful candidate becomes a lieutenant, and after three years' service on full pay, a captain. After twelve years' service on full pay—including at least three years abroad—he may become a major, provided he meets certain requirements. The chief requirement is that he pass an examination in those very subjects which are prominent in the entrance examination, and also display a knowledge of hygiene and of the administrative work connected with the medical service. He has to write a report on some professional subject and to supply certain certificates.

There is no evidence that this examination is other than a somewhat lenient affair, and, be that as it may, it is not of a character to encourage the best type of professional work in a man who has already held a commission for twelve years. In the place of this questionable test it would be well to institute an examination in certain special subjects, and to supplement that by a moderate general examination.

The special subjects should be such as ophthalmic surgery, laryngology, nervous affections, tropical diseases, operative surgery, and others. The result of such a test would be this—that officers before promotion to the rank of major would have to furnish evidence of having kept up their general knowledge of medicine and

surgery, as at present, and of, moreover, possessing a sound knowledge of some one special branch of practice. The individual officer would be thus encouraged, from the time of obtaining his commission, to follow up his professional work, and to make himself proficient in a particular branch of it. By such work he would secure his promotion. The Director-General, on the other hand, would gradually acquire the services of men who had made themselves proficient in special branches of medicine and surgery, and who could be located where their particular qualifications would be most valuable. Some such course is more or less inevitable, for so wide now has become the art and science of medicine that it is almost impossible to expect an individual to possess a thorough and practical knowledge of all the subjects embraced by that science.

Two minor matters incidental to the encouragement of professional work in the Royal Army Medical Corps may here be alluded to. Firstly, it is natural that those who seek a commission in the Service should endeavour to obtain it as soon as possible after they have become qualified. It thus happens that few who enter the Army can afford to hold the exceedingly valuable offices of house surgeon or house physician in a large hospital. It would be well if such especial leave could be given to officers who have just joined as would enable them to hold these appointments without loss of seniority.

Secondly, the purely professional side of the Army Medical Service could be materially helped if some mutual arrangement for the carrying out of certain hospital work could be entered into between the civil and military hospitals.

The second recommendation of the Commissioners deals with a matter of pressing importance, viz. the obtaining of a sufficient number of surgeons to be added to the Staff of the Royal Army Medical Corps in the event of a great war. It is obvious that no medical establishment in the Army could be maintained perpetually on a war footing. Unfortunately, the demands upon the Service during the times of peace and during the progress of a great war present differences so enormous that they cannot be met by any reasonable compromise. It is a little unsatisfactory to maintain the Army medical service on a peace footing, and then to trust to the services of casual volunteers in the event of a war. The civil surgeons who filled up the ranks of the Royal Army Medical Corps in the present campaign did admirable work, but they had no knowledge of the routine of military duties, nor of military methods and discipline. They were consequently ineffective except when accompanied, and to some extent controlled, by officers of the Service.

This obvious difficulty could be met by the establishment of an Army Medical Reserve upon the lines of the Military Reserve. For the first two or three years after a student has obtained his qualifi-

cation, he is apt to find himself too well supplied with leisure. He is hardly in a position to commence practice, even should he have at his disposal the means for such a step, and, as a matter of fact, it will be found that many occupy the early years which immediately follow graduation by travelling, by holding the post of resident officer in smaller hospitals, by acting as ships' surgeons, and by working as qualified assistants. There would, I think, be little difficulty in enrolling from among the ranks of the 'recently qualified' a valuable Medical Reserve on the following lines. Candidates would be required to serve for three years, one year of which would be with the Colours, and two in the Reserve. When in the Reserve they would of course be perfectly free to occupy themselves as they thought fit. In the event of a war the Director-General would have at his immediate disposal a number of young surgeons who had been carefully selected, and who would already possess such a knowledge of military routine as would enable them to be of the utmost service. So far as the members of the Reserve themselves are concerned, the engagement would not be irksome to the many who had not as yet taken upon themselves the more serious duties of professional life, and few men would be other than benefited by twelve months' well-directed discipline. It is obvious that the members of this Reserve would have to be adequately remunerated, but even if that remuneration were liberal it would, I think, be still found to be on the side of economy.

With regard to the fourth recommendation of the Commissioners there can be little doubt as to the value of the suggestion. The good orderly is a *rara avis*, and a very liberal employment of nurses in fixed hospitals has proved in the present campaign to be in every way eminently satisfactory. Orderlies should be reserved for the field hospitals, in which the employment of nurses is impossible. There is no doubt that all nursing should be in the hands of properly trained women whenever and wherever the employment of women is possible.

The fifth suggestion in the report will also commend itself strongly to all who have interested themselves in the care of the sick and wounded in war; and it may be well to add to the suggestion that the sanitary officer should not only be 'properly qualified,' but should be placed in such a position of authority as would enable him to go beyond the mere making of recommendations.

SHAM VERSUS REAL HOME DEFENCE

As Colonel Lonsdale Hale, in his article of last month, has referred very fully to me and to the views which I put forward about Home Defence, perhaps I may be permitted to say a few words myself upon those views. I should hardly have ventured to publish the last chapter of my *Great Boer War* had I realised the number of controversies in which it would plunge me, and yet I cannot regret it since I am more convinced than ever that my conclusions are sound, now that they have run the gauntlet of a good deal of professional criticism, and come out undamaged, or at least very slightly modified.

A large part of that last chapter was devoted to the effect which the war has had, and will have, upon the different arms in our Service. Some of the views there put forward are already accomplished facts. I refer to this because it shows that, though some of my critics have discounted my remarks as being those of a civilian, my judgment was none the less correct as to the military lessons of the war. I spoke, for example, of the need for breaking up batteries into their sections, and it has been very largely done since then. I spoke of the approximation of the cavalry to the mounted infantry, and we have seen a cavalry brigade go out armed with the rifle. I spoke of the uselessness of the lance, and I saw a letter from a lancer the other day which described how they stuck their lances into the ground at the beginning of an action, and came back for them when it was finished. I spoke of the necessity for getting the extra seven stone off the cavalry horses, and something has since then been done in that direction. In these and other instances I read the signs of the times correctly. I put forward this fact to screen me against the foolish and narrow-minded suggestion that a civilian cannot be correct in military matters—a suggestion which has never been made by Colonel Lonsdale Hale, but frequently in other quarters.

The remainder of my last chapter was devoted to sketching out a method of reorganising our military forces by which, as it seemed to me, they might be made more formidable. The encouragement of the civilian rifleman was only one out of several factors which were to add to our strength, but for some reason it appears to have eclipsed

all the others completely, and to have left upon the mind of some professional critics the idea of a bogey rifleman—a dreadful person, undisciplined, turbulent, unorganised, pushing aside regulars, volunteers, and militia, to claim the sole right of forming that mob behind a hedge-row which seems to act as a nightmare upon so many military writers. It was remarked lately, with great truth, in an article in the *Spectator*, that if my suggestion had been to put the navy out of commission, and to disband the army, some of the criticisms which have been evoked could not be more grotesque. There are many who may have read these criticisms without seeing the original article, so let me say again for their benefit that I have never contemplated the civilian rifleman as our first line of defence. Let us first have an overpowering navy, let us next have as large and efficient an army as we can afford, let us back it up by a strong militia, and a generously encouraged volunteer force. Then, and only then, let us make a reserve of the rest of the nation by covering the country with rifle clubs, and teaching every man that which is the most difficult and the most essential portion of a soldier's training. If the net result of the movement should be a single rifleman, he will be one rifleman to the good. How the country could suffer by such an addition to its defences passes the wit of man to discover, and yet I have read a dozen articles which allude to it as if it were the obvious end of the British Empire. Perhaps the fault lies with some obscurity of expression of my own, and so I will go over the ground again, with such additions or modifications as have been suggested by fuller consideration and by criticism.

There is a limit to the amount of money which can be spent upon the regular army without excessive taxation on the one side or starving the navy on the other. How are we to spend this sum? Is it better to get the largest number we can at the lowest wage, or would it be better to have fewer at a wage which would ensure that they should be picked men. Personally I believe that we should get better value for our money by having fewer regulars and paying them more highly. Every officer knows that he has certain men in his regiment or battery who are useless as fighting men. Yet these men take the same pay, the same food, the same equipment, and the same transport as an efficient soldier. The British soldier has his fighting to do in Northern India, in Southern Africa, or in China. Is it not false economy to transport a man for these thousands of miles; and to sustain him there, unless he is absolutely a first-class article? Many that we now have are first-class material. But many are not. If you wish that they should all be so, you can only effect it by raising the pay until there is a keen competition to enter the army, and you can dismiss the worthless man with the certainty of getting a better one in his place. By doing this you are diminishing the numbers of the paper army, but you are not

diminishing the numbers of your effective army. When the pinch came in South Africa, nearly a hundred thousand men who had figured in our paper army were left behind because they were unfit to go out. Yet these useless men were costing the country great sums of money. With a higher scale of pay you would have fewer men, but they would all be effectives, and no money would be wasted. It may be argued that the hundred thousand men were of the nature of a reserve who would mature as the war went on. But such a reserve might as well be formed at the outbreak of a war, and would equally mature. We should not then be paying for so large a number of inefficient men in time of peace.

A man who is not a good shot is not merely no use in the firing line, but he becomes a positive hindrance, as he is likely to be himself hit, and when hit he has to be tended. There should be no place in the regular army for a man who is not a marksman. But at present we have to be only too glad to enrol any man of the required measurements who presents himself, and to retain him, however hopeless his shooting may be. If the scale of pay were high enough you could ensure that every man should be a dead shot—or should become one under penalty of dismissal. Under such a system it would be your much-abused civilian rifle clubs which would furnish you with the best recruits. Colonials too with a taste for adventure would flock into the ranks of the Imperial army.

If you were to pay two shillings or half-a-crown clear a day, and so secure a good long-service soldier whom you could train to a very high pitch of efficiency, how many would be sufficient for the needs of the Empire? I should suggest as many as we could afford to have. But at so high a rate of pay the number must be limited. I mentioned 100,000 in my original article and my critics have convinced me that it is an under-estimate. I amended it to 130,000, to contain a large corps of highly trained mounted infantry. The scheme must be supplemented by home arrangements by which nearly all these men would be available for the service of the outer Empire. In that case they would represent nearly as large a force as we could possibly send abroad at present—and an infinitely more effective one.

Apart from the fact that without compulsory service we cannot have more soldiers than we can afford to pay for, there is much to be said, as it seems to me, for the small effective mobile army, as against the large one. If one considers a modern battlefield one cannot but wonder where the large army is going to put itself. When advances are conducted with intervals of ten paces, and a company covers a thousand yards, a comparatively small army occupies a very great area. The attack advances in successive waves, but each wave must come some distance behind the other, and a brigade may find itself with a front of several miles and perhaps a

mile of depth. Any other formation becomes impossible under magazine fire. Several brigades, therefore, will occupy the greatest space which a general can control. Where is he to put his great numbers? If they wait as reserves, they will, if they are within five miles, be exposed to the enemy's shell fire, without being able to help in the engagement. If they are beyond that distance, their presence will have no effect save a moral one on the battle that is being fought. The large army will doubtless endeavour to outflank the small, but even the small army upon the defensive can cover a very extended area, and the large one may find it difficult to turn its flanks, and may then itself be so far removed from the centre that the supply of food and ammunition will become a serious matter. Altogether, Providence is not now so obviously upon the side of the big battalions, and a decrease of numbers and increase of efficiency may prove to be the general law of the future. This, however, is speculation. What is certain, as it seems to me, is that : (1) It is false economy to employ anything but a first-class man ; (2) That you can only get first-class men by a considerable increase in pay ; (3) That this must mean a decrease in numbers.

Now if the regular army is to be set free for the service of the Empire, it can only be safely done by making ourselves invulnerable at home. There is only one way in which this can be effected, and that is by the enforcement of the militia ballot for home defence. Colonel Lonsdale Hale advocates this measure as if it were an antidote to the civilian riflemen. I have merely advocated the civilian riflemen as a supplement to a reorganised militia. 'We must depend upon a developed system of militia,' I say in one place, and later, 'We must have such an extension of the Militia Act' as would give us a competent home defence army. That demon civilian rifleman seems somehow to have drawn the attention of every military critic from all the points of my suggestion except his undisciplined self. Not only have I made the same suggestion as Colonel Lonsdale Hale now puts forward, but I have indicated how things may be done which he states as desirable. For example, he says, 'The regular army must no longer use the militia as its milch-cow.' This can only be prevented by putting the regular army upon an entirely different footing as a highly-paid foreign-service army in some such way as is here suggested.

There are two alternatives before the nation, and one or other must eventually be adopted. The first is universal military service by which the whole nation might be passed through the ranks, each man serving for one year and then being enrolled in the reserve. That such a measure would have an admirable effect on the physique and, in some ways, upon the mind of the nation is undoubted. But I do not think that it has come within the range of practical politics. People do not make such changes in cold blood. Nothing short of a

European coalition will ever rouse us to the pitch of national energy which would be necessary for making a new departure so foreign to our traditions. Besides we cannot pretend that we really have, or could have, need for so numerous a host as such a measure would produce.

It is different with the militia ballot, which is a good old constitutional measure of native growth. If it were used impartially, temperately, and with discretion and consideration, I do not think that the nation would now shrink from it. The present Government is strong enough to pass such a measure, but its effect would be much greater if the details could be settled by a committee drawn from both political parties. The men should be under arms for at least a year, during which time they would draw little pay, but they should be well fed, well lodged, and considerately treated in every way. Let them be sedulously exercised in what is practical in a soldier's duties, in judging distance, in shooting at unknown ranges, in entrenching, but let us at last have an end of those vexatious pieces of routine which bear no relation to true discipline. The soldier's time is wasted and his patience tried by childish roll-calls (four of them a day), by mechanical manoeuvres of no service in warfare, and by the polishing and whitening of metal or straps which seem to be chosen for the express purpose of giving trouble. A brown strap instead of a white one, or a horn button instead of a metal one, makes no great difference to a uniform, but a great deal to its wearer. Relaxation in all such matters should be accompanied by greater severity in cases of drunkenness, desertion, or other offences which really do impair a man's value as a soldier.

I find then that I am in perfect agreement with Colonel Lonsdale Hale upon the question of the militia, of which I should like to see 150,000 under arms. We come therefore to the next line of defence in the volunteers. The only change which such a scheme as I have outlined would cause in this force is that their capitation grant should be increased, their equipment improved, and their organisation made as business-like as possible. At the same time I do most strongly believe that Colonel Lonsdale Hale is much too depreciatory in his allusions to the volunteer soldier. The only opportunity which we have ever had of trying him has been in South Africa, where we have had volunteers—*i.e.* non-professional soldiers—from every part of the Empire: British volunteers, Canadians, Anglo-Indians, Australians, New Zealanders, Rhodesians, Natalians, Cape Colonists and refugees. There were some 1,800 C.I.V.'s, and all of them, horse, foot, and artillery, did most excellently. Of the volunteer companies of the regular regiments I do not know enough to speak, but I remember that when shrapnel burst over the volunteer company of the Gordons, and struck down seventeen men, the rest of the company marched on as if nothing had occurred. Men of such nerve

should be good enough for anything. The yeomanry who were largely civilians were invaluable. Of the Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders nothing but praise has been heard. At the battle of Rhenoster Kop the other day the New Zealanders were, in the presence of two veteran regular regiments, awarded the honours of the day. These men were graziers, shepherds and small farmers. The Canadian volunteers bore off the honours of Paardeberg, and the Australians and Rhodesians those of Eland's River, the best defence of the war. The defence of Mafeking was conducted by a garrison in which, outside the officers, there were no regular soldiers. The South African volunteers have more successes and fewer failures in their record than any body of men in the country. The defence of Wepener was almost entirely their own. Thorneycroft's Irregular Horse stood the fiery ordeal of Spion Kop and lost more heavily in proportion to their number than any other corps. It was a body of Natal volunteers who blew up the first Long Tom at Ladysmith. Above all, the single regiment which has carried off by general consent the honours of the war is a regiment of non-professional soldiers, the famous Imperial Light Horse. Everywhere over the seat of war the lesson has been the same—that the volunteer soldier, British or Colonial, is little, if at all, inferior to his professional brother. Why, then, should Colonel Lonsdale Hale say that 'the much-vaunted voluntary system has been at work for years, and has shown itself to be a complete failure in producing an efficient army of good troops for Home Defence'? The samples which we have tried prove them to be excellent troops. They may not be perfect at barrack-square tricks, and their uniforms are occasionally rather weird, but they are keen, intelligent and brave. Colonel Lonsdale Hale's *ordre-de-bataille* army would not be weakened, I think, by a leavening of volunteers.

The introduction of the militia ballot would furnish a most powerful weapon for strengthening the volunteers, as exemption from the ballot might be granted to those men who undertook to make themselves efficient and to remain in the corps for five years. In the same way they would be officered by gentlemen who wished to avoid the militia. If mounted infantry and cyclist corps were raised in each battalion, and if each district were made to furnish a proper proportion of infantry, engineers and artillery, then each would become a complete little military unit capable of exercising all arms upon a field day or conducting operations against a neighbouring district.

I hope I have shown now that in no part of the scheme suggested did I desire to supersede existing forces, but that on the contrary I desired a long-service, highly-paid army for the service of the Empire, and a compulsory militia and highly-organised volunteer force for the defence of our own shores. There remain those terrible civilian riflemen. My argument—which I fear that I have repeated

ad nauseam—is that the greater portion of the manhood of this country cannot under existing circumstances serve in the volunteers. Their distance from a centre or the nature of their occupations prevents them. Is it then impossible to utilise them in any way, or to form them into any sort of a national reserve? I believe that it is perfectly possible, and indeed easy, to induce them to acquire skill with the rifle, and I assert that a country in which a fair proportion of the male inhabitants are good riflemen becomes for that reason formidable. We have had an object lesson of this in South Africa, and in spite of Colonel Lonsdale Hale I maintain that both Switzerland and Norway are examples of the same thing. It is absurd to contend that because Switzerland was overrun by the French at the end of the eighteenth century, at a time when that country had deep political dissensions, that that shakes my argument. It is the long-distance magazine rifle which has made the defence so strong against the attack, and people like the Swiss, who have made rifle-shooting their national pastime, could, I believe, never be subdued.

If then behind our army, behind our militia, and behind our volunteers we had the main body of the people of this country expert in the use of the rifle, it seems to me to be a truism to say that it would greatly strengthen our military position. All these questions about their organisation, their transport—one critic was even anxious about their hats—are premature. The first practical thing is to get the butts, the rifles, and the men. This should not be hard. The less Government helps the better, I think. We are getting too much into the way of crying for help when we should be doing things for ourselves. Government should at once remove the tax upon rifles, and it should supply rifles and cartridges at absolute cost price to *bonâ fide* rifle clubs. So much is bare justice, but we should ask no more. Let miniature ranges (Morris-tube or other) be started in every village, and then let the neighbouring miniature clubs combine in each district to have one proper range open to all of them. I will answer for it that there will be no want of riflemen who will be perfectly willing to pay for their own cartridges, and who will rapidly develop into good shots. It is for the country gentlemen all over Britain to give the lead in starting such clubs. If any reader should desire exact information how to do it, and the cost involved, I should be happy to answer any inquiry addressed to me here at Hindhead. Our own club is a great success, and is already the father of several others.

Now we will suppose that these clubs form a network over the whole country, as I believe that they will do, and that in a few years there is a national reserve of half a million of men who can use a rifle. How are these men to be used in case of an emergency? Are they to be led as they are against an enemy, lined up behind a hedge, and left there? That is midsummer madness. And yet from the tone of

my critics one would imagine that such a suggestion had been made. These half-million men would form a great reservoir upon which all the branches of the Service would draw. They would not remain as a force of civilian riflemen at all. In the universal enthusiasm which would be called forth by a menace of invasion they would flock in to fill the gaps of the militia and the volunteers—even in some cases of the regulars—and instead of raw recruits these regiments would find that they had got men who were already highly instructed in that which is the most essential and the most difficult part of a soldier's education. In this guise, as regulars, militia, and volunteers, they would help to line the hedge-rows of England, those hedge-rows which Lord Dundonald, fresh from South Africa, described the other day as being as formidable for defence as the kopjes. A residue of civilian riflemen would be left over to serve as guides, scouts, and irregulars in the particular district which they inhabit.

Now what is there against such a scheme? It is quite independent of and supplementary to all other lines of defence, and can therefore interfere with none of them. Is the objection that it will engage the attention of Government and distract it from other reforms? But it requires a minimum of attention from Government. Is it that it will intercept recruits for the militia and volunteers? It was argued once that the volunteers would do this, but in practice it is rather found that when a man has once begun to handle a rifle he is often inclined to go further with it. Is it that it is a sham or untried movement? But it was always suggested as being a supplement to a militia ballot, so it will not interfere with the drilled soldier. Why then has the civilian rifleman idea encountered so bitter an opposition? Is it that the very word 'civilian' seems to imply a want of confidence in the professional? But Colonel Lonsdale Hale truly says, 'The feelings of national patriotism, personal pride, and self-respect, love of country and home, combine to treat with scorn, and even indignation, the notion that the defence of the heart of the Empire should be conducted solely by the "professionals."' But if these are his sentiments, why does he object to civilians preparing themselves in the only way possible for the duty which may lie before them?

Supposing for argument's sake that such a scheme as that which is here outlined were adopted, how would the force of the country stand?

Regular Army, 130,000.—Highly-paid army of long-service men. One hundred and fifteen thousand might be taken as actually with the colours abroad. Fifteen thousand represent the Guards and the depôts at home. This force could be extended in time of war, and supplemented by organised colonial contingents so as to bring it to at least 200,000 effectives.

Militia Army, 150,000.—For home defence only. Raised by ballot. Pay small, but every effort made to study the comfort and convenience of the men, while making them good practical soldiers.

Volunteers, 250,000.—Men serving in this unpaid force and making themselves thoroughly efficient should be exempt from the militia ballot.

Yeomanry.—Men volunteering for this should also be exempt from the year's training under arms involved in the ballot. By this means there should be no difficulty in raising 20,000.

Reserves from the Regulars.—There would be a considerable force of reserves, at first from men who had served under the present conditions, and later from men who had done their term of service in the reformed army. Say 80,000.

Then finally *Civilian Riflemen*.—Rifle clubs should eliminate bad shots and have on their rolls only expert riflemen. A strong effort should be made by individual patriotism and public opinion to enrol the greater part of the men of the nation, of any age, in these clubs, which would form a reserve for all other forces of the Crown. We will suppose that they reach 500,000.

The net result would be that we should have in the service of the Empire an army as numerous as we could send abroad now, but of far greater efficiency, and that at home we should have a million men of different grades, but all accustomed to the use of arms. I have not reckoned in this enumeration the trained men who have passed through the militia. These alone would soon amount to some hundreds of thousands. If such a state of things were brought about I cannot understand the frame of mind of the man who would still fear invasion. It may be objected that there is no guarantee that the 500,000 civilian riflemen would respond to the call of duty. The guarantee lies in the national spirit, which was never more alive than now; but if there should be any hanging back Parliament could of course on an emergency pass a universal compulsory service Bill which would place them all at the disposal of the State. Even at the risk of annoying Colonel Lonsdale Hale I am bound to repeat that under these conditions (all of which were laid down in my original article, save that I understated the regular army by 30,000) I still think that 'the bugbear of an invasion of Great Britain would be reduced to an absurdity,' and that 'the invasion of Kent or Sussex, always a desperate operation, has become an impossible one.'

As to the exact method in which these very large forces should be disposed in the event of an invader landing, I bow to Colonel Lonsdale Hale's authority. What seems to me certain is that if we only have men enough, and rifles enough, and the men can use the rifles, our vastly superior numbers must bring us victory. We

might be beaten and beaten again, but we should come and come again, and for ever replenish our losses far more rapidly than the invader could do. He could move in no direction without having to carry positions, and all England would be one endless vista of positions, with swarms of men to hold them—'a huge crowd of men firing rifles from behind hedge-rows,' as Colonel Lonsdale Hale, with the bogey rifleman always before his eyes, prefers to describe it. The Colonel goes on to state that professional soldiers search through the military history of the world to find any support for such a theory of defence, and search in vain. The very thing itself is going on before our eyes in South Africa. If the numbers of the Boers had been far superior to our own what chance would we have had of being able to conquer their country? But the Colonel does less than justice to his own knowledge of military history when he asserts that he cannot recall many instances of undisciplined, or slightly disciplined, fighting men being able to hold their own against highly organised troops, and even, unless in a hopeless minority, being able to tire them out. Apart from South Africa and the recent instance of the Afridis, which are the more important as showing how modern weapons have affected the question, we have in the past such examples as the American War of Independence, the victories of Hofer over the Bavarians and the French in 1809, the three years' struggle between the Vendéans and the Republican armies, and many others which occur to even so superficial a student of military history as myself. •

In conclusion let me say that I fully recognise that Colonel Lonsdale Hale is earnestly pursuing the same object as myself, although I have the temerity to differ from him in detail. I hope that, if he will do me the honour to read what I have written, he will find that our points of agreement are more numerous and of strife less serious than he has, possibly through my own faults of expression, been led to believe. It is an invidious thing to argue upon professional subjects with a professional man, but I do it under a strong sense of duty, feeling convinced that the country is suffering from want of men, and that the men could easily be found if some method could be devised by which they could render themselves efficient. Without universal compulsory service I can think of no way save the extension of rifle clubs to get at the main body of the people, and that is why I grudge no time or work which can help to that end.

A. CONAN DOYLE.

Undershaw, Hindhead, Haslemere.

THE ADMIRALTY VERSUS THE NAVY

WHEN a year ago I pointed out certain grave defects, all, however, easily remediable, in the Navy, I was met with the rejoinder in the press that no fleet would stand such detailed criticism. But let me now say that I have seen a navy that will. It is the German, which is going to be in the very near future our most formidable rival. In the German Navy and in the German organisation one can find nothing to blame and very much to praise. They are already the model for the world. From top to bottom they are thorough; at every turn they bear the impress of careful thought. Mobilisation, dockyards, ships, officers and men, all are such as reason would have them. Tradition, appearances, the conservatism which is born of routine and habit, are in Germany all brushed ruthlessly aside. Everything is sacrificed to efficiency, and efficiency is the factor which ultimately tells in life and in war.

There are three heads under which criticism of our navy may best be grouped—organisation, material, and personnel. In the public mind there is always a tendency to attach excessive importance to the second, though it is really upon the first and third that the usefulness of the material depends. Ships are valueless if they are not correctly designed, if arrangements are not made for bringing them to bear upon the enemy's forces, and if the officers and men are not there to take them to sea or are not so instructed as to employ them to advantage. Organisation in particular has a preponderating influence in a day of great navies, yet less attention is commonly paid to it than to either of the other points.

I. ORGANISATION

The organisation of the British Navy is a survival from a remote past, when the conditions of war were in many essentials different. It has been altered and changed, but to suit the convenience of the political parties which alternately govern this country, and not with any idea of adapting it to modern requirements. Essentially it is based upon *the negation of direct responsibility*. There is a political First Lord in the Cabinet, who generally has no technical knowledge

of naval matters. He is aided by four naval officers, usually of flag-rank, a civil lord, and a financial secretary. These two last are politicians, generally with no knowledge of naval affairs, though fortunately in the present Administration the financial secretary happens to be a man who has studied the navies of the world and naval history with the utmost care.

'Boards,' said Sydney Smith, 'are only meant to serve as screens.' In this case responsibility is completely lost in the Board. There is a conflict of opinion as to whether the First Lord is the superior or the equal of the First Sea Lord, and whether the second and fourth Sea Lords and the Controller—who is the naval officer charged with the superintendence of construction—are the equals or inferiors of the First Sea Lord. There is even conflict between the various ordinances to which the Admiralty owes its existence. The patent appointing the Board does not distinguish between the First Lord and the other Lords, and might be held to regard them as equals: an Order in Council in 1869, however, made the First Sea Lord responsible for the personnel and condition of the fleet to the First Lord, who was again made-responsible to Parliament. But this order was rescinded under Mr. Goschen in 1872. Such is the confusion at the present moment that, as a long correspondence in the *Times* has shown, the most distinguished officers in the navy and ex-Sea Lords themselves do not know what precisely is the responsibility that attaches to each member of the Board.

The advocates of the present system assure us that it is 'elastic.' Contrast with it the ideal outlined by Stein and existing in the Germany of our own day, where there is no Board and no confusion as to duties and responsibilities:

The principal object is to give the greatest possible unity, energy, and activity to the administration of affairs, to cause it to converge to the highest point, . . . combining independence and free initiative with complete responsibility.

Theoretically the German organisation is perfect; practically it works splendidly. This is an incontrovertible statement. There is a Naval Minister, who is an Admiral, with great professional knowledge; a Commander-in-chief under the Emperor: for though called by the name of *General-Inspekteur der Marine*, this is really Admiral Koester's office; and a Chief-of-the-Staff, with a carefully chosen General Staff. The *Admiralstab* (General Staff) is concerned with the distribution of ships, mobilisation, manœuvres, study of foreign navies, and general preparation for war. Its analogue does not exist in our navy, and its want is a defect which may have the gravest consequences. It is in vain that great seamen, such as Admiral Hornby, and military students, such as Mr. Spenser Wilkinson, have pointed to the necessity of remedying the defect. The stock argument to 'Let well alone' is the only reply they have been able to extort from an indifferent public.

The General Staff has been well described as 'the brain of the navy' by Mr. Wilkinson, because it does the thinking and foreseeing. To some extent, no doubt, the Intelligence Department covers the same ground, but not by any means completely. In the German General Staff the Intelligence Department is but one of other departments. Nor is our First Sea Lord, as has sometimes been said, virtually a Chief-of-the-Staff or naval Commander-in-Chief. A commander cannot be the equal of those commanded or *primus inter pares*; nor would a real Chief-of-the-Staff be harassed with such questions as collisions, slave trade, rewards for deserters, regulation of uniform, and hydrography.

A priori, then, from a study of our organisation, we should expect to find a lack of foresight, fleets badly distributed, and general unpreparedness for war, and this not so much because the Sea Lord or Sea Lords are wanting in the sense of duty, as because they have not time to attend to everything or leisure to think out and frame general views. Then, too, action by a Board of four or five people is sure to be slow, timid, and hesitating. The Board is a council of war, with all the council of war's proverbial defects. This alone seems to spell failure in war.

If we look at the distribution of the various squadrons, we shall see just these faults exhibited. There are four great British fleets maintained in time of peace, one with reduced crews. Three—the Channel, Reserve, and Mediterranean fleets—are in European waters; one, the China fleet, in the Far East. Not one of these four last autumn was properly composed or prepared for war. The Channel fleet had eight battleships and four available cruisers. Now such a proportion of cruisers is utterly inadequate. In a big fleet, which may have to blockade the enemy's ports, hunt for his ships, or hurry post-haste to the Mediterranean to reinforce our squadron in that sea, there should be at least eight, or, if we can judge from manœuvre practice, twelve to sixteen cruisers. There should be destroyers, fleet-colliers, a repair-ship and a distilling ship. Without these cruisers and adjuncts the fleet is not ready for war. It is not as though we had not got the cruisers: we have them in our home ports, out of commission, rusting in the basins. It is perfectly well known that it takes from a month to a year for a newly commissioned ship to become perfectly efficient. Thus at the critical moment the Channel Squadron will be hampered by a number of hastily manned, inefficient vessels. Further, the crews of the Channel Squadron are, in normal time, too young. An enormous proportion of boys and ordinary seamen is serving on board them, and, in the opinion of many Channel officers, it would be dangerous to go but and fight till this raw material had been stiffened. Thus it cannot be said that the squadron is ready for war.

The case of the Reserve fleet is yet worse. It is composed of a

number of old battleships, all of which need the most drastic reconstruction. Normally, its component members are scattered round the coast half manned. For one or two months in each year it is assembled and trained, but there are many reasons why its fighting value is low. The training given is altogether insufficient, the officers are generally old and weary of the service, the ships are bad, and there are only four cruisers to thirteen battleships. Yet, as in case of war the Channel Squadron is sure to be sent to the Mediterranean, this is the force upon which we depend for the command of the Channel and the North Sea. Far better would it be to reduce the number of ships in commission, but to keep them concentrated, fully manned, and always manœuvring, while thoroughly reconstructing the ships not in service.

Next we come to the Mediterranean fleet. At this moment the fleet contains ten battleships, three old ironclads, seven protected cruisers, fifteen destroyers, and several torpedo boats, some of which are so old as to be practically valueless. The fleet is in a position of great responsibility and danger. At Toulon are the headquarters of the French Navy in the Mediterranean, which can at any time put six perfectly modern battleships, three older ones, ten cruisers, and a host of torpedo craft to sea. Besides this, the Russian fleets have to be watched. In the Mediterranean, Russia has one battleship, in the Black Sea seven, and these may always attempt to combine with the French or try a stroke against Egypt and the Suez Canal. It is a nice problem, how, with ten modern battleships, at once to close the Straits of Gibraltar and to watch fourteen hostile battleships, when these fourteen are distributed as are the French and Russian. If anyone wants to understand the perilous situation, the utter inadequacy of the Mediterranean fleet, let him place himself, in imagination, in the position of the Admiral in command of it, and think how the ten ships are to be disposed. He will speedily see that the problem is an insoluble one, and that reinforcements—strong reinforcements—are absolutely necessary. Notoriously, the Admiral on the station has asked for them; notoriously, they have been refused him. Mark that he is so ill supplied with cruisers that he cannot in these craft hold his own against France alone, and that when war comes he will, through this weakness, have to grope in the dark for information. Mark, too, that his twenty efficient destroyers and torpedo-boats will have to look after about one hundred French craft of this type.

But even this is not the worst. Placed in the very forefront of the battle, as the Mediterranean fleet must be, one would expect it to be made up with the extremest care. One great advantage of our navy is the homogeneity of its ships—that is to say, our ships are built in batches of six or eight or even more. Homogeneity in a squadron is of great military importance. It means that the ships are of the same

pattern, armament, speed, manœuvring power, and coal supply—fitted to act together. But in the Mediterranean fleet this advantage has been thrown away. Of battleships (ten in all) there are *four* different types. Of protected cruisers (seven in all) there are *six* different types. There can be no excuse for this state of things. 'Falstaff's army is not in it with our fleet,' says a Mediterranean officer of distinction. The destroyers are just as bad. To quote the same officer :

Some are 27-knot boats, some of the newer 30-knot type ; some can be depended on to steam and some cannot ; some can use all their boilers and some none of them ; some appear to have been kept in England till they are falling to pieces and then they are sent to a foreign station to torment the soul of its commander-in-chief. . . . It is imperative that this station should be strengthened without delay by the addition of (a) workshop ships, (b) distilling ship, (c) store ship. . . . If this fleet is allowed to remain any longer in its present extremely unsatisfactory condition, it is to be feared that the awakening will be as bitter to the British public as it has been in other directions.

This was written nine months ago, and yet there has been no marked improvement.

The China fleet through the autumn and winter has been in an equally unsatisfactory position. The immense importance of this station, to which larger and larger fleets are yearly being transferred by European Powers, does not seem to have 'struck' the Admiralty till our squadron was outnumbered in the all-important factor, battleships, by Russia and France in the ratio of two to one. During the summer of 1900 our battleships on the station were the new *Goliath*, and the lightly armed *Centurion* and *Barfleur*. Against these the Russians had the *Petropavlosk*, *Sissoi Veliki*, and *Navarin*, and the French the *Redoubtable*. The four ships had a great advantage in artillery. In October the Russians sent out two more battleships of most formidable type—the *Pollava* and *Sebastopol*—raising the combined total to six. Then tardily, after waiting till these vessels had arrived, the British Admiralty replied with the despatch of two more battleships, one of which has only just started, and has been detached from the Mediterranean fleet, where it cannot well be spared. In modern cruisers England had been out-matched, though not to the same degree. For whole months even the German fleet in the Far East was stronger in military qualities than our own, which had to descend to the fourth place, behind Japan, Russia and Germany. In all essentials our China fleet is worse off than our Mediterranean fleet. Indeed its only base, Hong Kong, is not only inadequately equipped, but also has its defences planned on the assumption that our fleet commands the sea. That our fleet does not command the sea in the Far East, and cannot hope to do so in the near future, is obvious. It then follows that, in the event of war, Hong Kong will be lost. The Navy League branch there is fully aware of the danger ; naval officers are aware of it ; but the

required reinforcements are not sent, and the public at home takes little interest in the fortune of its distant dependency.

Such, then, is our organisation for war in the case of our four most important fleets. Not one is prepared; not one is adequate. Yet it must be remembered that in a naval conflict *the opening moves are made before the struggle begins*, and upon these opening moves will depend victory or defeat. Mistakes in the mobilisation and initial distribution of forces, as Moltke has said, can rarely or never be overcome. Nor is our naval predominance such that we are able to play tricks with our fleet or fool any part of the extremely narrow margin of superiority, which we may possess, away. The destruction of our China fleet might upset the scanty basis of financial and political credit upon which our Empire rests: any catastrophe to the Mediterranean fleet would certainly upset that basis. Nor are these the mere words of an 'alarmist' or scare-monger. They are elementary deductions from the teaching of war in the past. Unhappily while British statesmen are never tired of repeating the simplest of general principles, such as this, that 'England must be supreme at sea,' they do not apply them or work them out in practice. The history of the South African war is before us in black and white to prove that our rulers do not understand war.

The best men in our navy have for generations seen and realised the defects of the Admiralty. Even in the Napoleonic wars it did not work half as well as its champions would have us believe. St. Vincent and Nelson are by no means complimentary in their references to the Boards with which they had to deal; St. Vincent, indeed, threatened that 'the next impertinence I receive will make room for Sir Hyde Parker.' Cockburn, who served through the war and was for years on the Board, left on his death a letter most strongly condemning it, and urging its abolition. Sir C. Napier before the Crimean War maintained that, if the Board continued in its then state, a 'great catastrophe will befall the country.' The management of this war on the naval side should be studied in Butler Earp's much-neglected *Baltic Campaign*. No one who reads will fail to say with the author:

What will be the result of effective Boards of Admiralty against an ineffective Board, it is not difficult to guess. . . . However these very matters of which we are now writing may be despised by Whitehall place-hunters, they will be cherished by Russia, France and America, and the result does not require a prophet to foretell. Every nation which in the whole range of history has fallen at all, has fallen from its own blind security in inadequate means, coupled with the acute vision of those who destroyed or supplanted it. England holds no charter from Divine providence which shall shield her from the consequences of ordinary cause and effect.

Nothing has changed for the better in the organisation. The fleet is more efficient, not because of a better Admiralty, but

because of the half-awakening of the Press and nation. The complete awakening has not come. Even the failure in South Africa of the parody of the Admiralty organisation, established by Mr. Balfour at the War Office in 1895, has not aroused the country. The explanation of this, at first sight, stupefying fact is contained in Colonel Stoffel's words addressed to Napoleon the Third before the disasters of 1870: 'Nations never reform the institutions which govern them, until compelled to do so by the rudest shocks.'

I might quote such men as Admiral Hornby, who said of the Admiralty that it was 'altogether inefficient for work,' Lord Charles Beresford, and Sir John Hopkins, all eminent in their profession, but enough evidence has been marshalled to convince all but those who, 'having eyes, see not.'

As for our mobilisation, this may be said of it: that, given ample notice, it works well. This much must be added: that our enemy in the future would be very careful not to give us such notice. The attack would come with the utmost suddenness; indeed, it is interesting to observe that the German Von der Goltz argues 'a rapid mobilisation may procure for us a momentary superiority over England,' and this superiority, one need scarcely add, would be used to the utmost. We know nothing positive as to what would be the result of a sudden order to mobilise, say in November or March. What is all too probable is, that the mobilisation would not compare in smoothness and rapidity with that which takes place before the manœuvres of each year.

Co-operation with the army is a matter which each year becomes of more and more importance. In Germany, the most careful precautions are taken to prevent any conflict between the two services, such as that which occurred in Santiago harbour between Admiral Sampson's navy and General Shafter's army. There is no divided command, for the Kaiser is at the head of both services; moreover a certain number of army officers are annually embarked in the fleet, and a certain number of naval officers sent to work ashore with the army. Why are not the same precautions taken in the organisation of our defences? The probable explanation is to be found in the two words, apathy and routine.

II. MATERIAL.

Here there are three questions of great importance to be answered.

Have we ships enough?

Are the ships of the right kind?

Are the dockyards and bases adequate and properly equipped?

Have we ships enough?—It is obvious that we have not ships enough ready for sea. Else were the present condition of the

Mediterranean and China fleets convincing proof of a degree of carelessness and indifference to national interests on the part of the Admiralty that would amount to treason. Indeed the late First Lord told us in 1900 that his programme was 'limited by what we deemed to be the possibility of output of this country as regards armour, machinery, hulls, and a vast number of accessories.' There was no suggestion that it was such as a General Staff would have required, keeping in view the possibility of a war with a combination of two Powers. And, indeed, remembering the enormous arrears of construction, it could not be pretended that the programme was all that could be desired. The figures for expenditure on new construction in England, France, and Russia from 1897 to 1900 show that 32,500,000*l.* was voted and only 27,400,000*l.* spent in England, allowing for the probable under-expenditure last year, while France and Russia spent between them over 30,600,000*l.*

If these figures are correct, it follows that, through under-expenditure, our fleet has been weakened to the extent of 15 per cent. below what the late First Lord told us in 1899 was 'the lowest programme by which we can secure the objects which the people expect of the navy.' I am aware that it is said by the ex-First Lord and his apologists that, of the under-expenditure of 1897, 1,400,000*l.* was to be made good in 1898 and 739,000*l.* in 1899. There is, however, no evidence to show that the need of making good the omissions of the past was kept in view when framing the estimates of 1898 and 1899. If the Admiralty and Treasury are not tricking the country, let them this year, and next year, frame their ship-building estimates so as sharply to distinguish outlay to make good past deficiencies from outlay upon genuine new construction.

As it is, it is impossible to say what in the sum voted in the estimates represents *bona fide* new construction and what sums voted and 'saved'—*pace* Lord Goschen, for the benefit of the Treasury—in previous years. Were such sums, when once voted for the navy, locked up, and not returned to the Treasury, but applied to the purchase of new cruisers and battleships from contractors whenever the actual expenditure on new construction fell below the vote, I venture to predict that the money would be found to be duly expended, and, if it were not, accounts would be simplified, the navy strengthened, the estimates kept down (through the same amount not being voted two or even three times over), and the nation would know how it stands.

At present no words can describe the disorganisation of our building programme. Battleships and cruisers are months and years in arrear, and all confidence in the power of the Admiralty to complete its programmes punctually has vanished. Here are a few figures to illustrate the delay which has occurred in the case of five first-class battleships. The last of these should have been at sea with our

fleet in February 1900. Actually all five are still incomplete one year later. The *Albion*, laid down in December 1896, should have been ready in August 1899. She will not be at sea before March. The *Vengeance*, laid down in August 1897, is not expected to hoist the pennant before next April. The *Formidable*, begun in March 1898, and the *Irresistible*, in April of that year, cannot be ready before July. The *Implacable* has a better record—from July 1898 to March of this year, but she, too, is more than a year behind her promised time.

It is a lamentable list. We know that in 1893-5 British battleships were built in our dockyards in twenty-four months; that in Russia a 14,500-ton armoured cruiser has just been completed in thirty months; that in the United States a first-class battleship has now to be completed by contractors in that time; and that in Germany efforts are being made to work up to this standard. Yet here we have from thirty-two to fifty-two months required to complete British battleships.

I hope that in the interests of the nation and the navy some of our contractors will open their mouths and tell the truth about the delays—tell us the full details of the unbusinesslike methods, the antediluvian conditions, the irritating, unnecessary, and hampering restrictions, the capricious inspections and alterations, the withholding of payments earned and the absurd craze for cheapness which are the root causes of these arrears in construction. Mr. Goschen's excuses in 1900 were torn to tatters by the experts in the engineering press. Unfortunately, though I have the particulars from the contractors, I have not permission to use them, and mere assertion does not carry conviction. Still the fact that our programmes are enormously in arrears is evidence that something is very wrong. On one of Mr. Goschen's excuses, however, I may dilate. When pressed in the debates on the Navy Estimates last year, on the reason for these delays, he said: 'The enforcement of penalties on firms who have not been able to secure the more rapid execution of their orders would be this—contractors would in future ask for *longer time* and for *higher prices*.'

Exactly: the Treasury would have to pay more—to pay a fair price, in fact. But does it cost the nation nothing to keep ships dawdling on the stocks or in the basins, while the invisible interest, which is national security, on the capital sunk in them is lost to the country? The five battleships which should be in service, but which are not ready, would turn the scale in China or in the Mediterranean. The absence of the twenty-three-knot cruisers which are so urgently needed to meet the commerce-destroyers of foreign Powers would be calamitous to the last degree in war. Everywhere more battleships, cruisers, and destroyers are wanted, and meantime our dockyards and shipbuilding yards are crammed with incomplete craft of

these types, destroyers now positively taking from five to six years in some instances to complete.

The actual number of battleships ready and building for England, France, Germany and Russia, is as follows, adopting the German rule and striking out every armour-clad which has been in existence over twenty-five years as having no *Gefechtswert*: England 37 ready and 16 building, France 28 ready and 5 building, Russia 19 ready and 9 building, and Germany 15 ready and 10 building. The figures are most disquieting and show how dubious is our position.

Many of the foreign ships are much smaller than ours, but against this must be set the fact to which I shall shortly advert, that abroad old ships have been in almost every case reconstructed, and in many cases re-armed. Ships armed with muzzle-loaders and with hulls of wood are, of course, struck off the list. We have still more than a score of this class of craft, whose *Gefechtswert* must be pronounced *nil*, in our effective list. No Admiralty, however, not even our own, would dare to send such vessels to sea in war. They ought certainly to be grouped as are the German ships of their date and type—the *Preussen*, *Friedrich der Grosse*, *Kronprinz*, and *Friedrich Karl*—under the heading ‘unbattleworthy.’

The fact is often overlooked that a mere qualitative or quantitative equality with the battleships of a hostile combination will not suffice to secure the British Empire. Perhaps the South African War has destroyed the illusion that always and under all circumstances an Englishman is the equal of one, two, or three enemies. We have seen ten Englishmen unsuccessfully chasing one enemy; and somewhat similar conditions may well obtain in the next war at sea; for instance, our battleships, like our armies, will have to act at great distances from their bases, while our cruisers will have to hunt for fleet and elusive commerce-destroyers. Not the least service which Mr. Laird Clowes has rendered to his country in his great naval history is to kill many of the silly legends which had gathered round the past—particularly that arch-fiction that we have generally won against great odds. On the contrary he shows that, with the exception of Nelson’s battles, ‘most of our great victories have been gained by superiority of numbers.’ Nelsons and Napoleons are rare phenomena; next time, indeed, the Nelson may be upon the other side, for all we know. The personal factor is so incalculable and indeterminate, that we cannot rely upon it for one moment. From the nature of our organisation, it is all too probable that when war comes, the right man will not be found at the head of each of our fleets. There have been occasions, and recent occasions, when great fleets of ours have been entrusted to Admirals who, to put it mildly, had not a high reputation for competence.

Are the ships of the right sort, properly armed and in a good condition for war? On this point the remark of a very acute

British critic is worth recording. 'I have a suspicion,' says this critic, 'that when our ships are put into battle, it will be found that they are admirable for everything else except fighting. They will have coal and ammunition supply; they will be comfortable; but they will not have enough guns, nor will everything in them have been subordinated to the one great end—destruction of the enemy in battle.'

Of our ships generally it may be said that they carry fewer guns in their displacement than do the warships of foreign Powers, and that they have no advantage in armour protection. The Americans, for instance, on 13,500 tons displacement produce a fighting machine which is in no sense inferior to our *Majestics* and *Formidables* of 15,000 tons. Elswick on a displacement of 9,900 tons produces for Japan an armoured cruiser, which, even in the opinion of many of our naval officers, is as good as the British *Cressy* of 12,000 tons. Nor does it necessarily follow, as is sometimes assumed, that because our ships are heavier, they have points of advantage which must tell in battle. It is quite possible that our hulls are too heavily built, or that weight is put into items which will prove of little importance in the actual combat. Foreign officers, with whom I have talked much, always comment with some surprise upon the relatively light batteries of our ships.

With the design of our most recent battleships there is probably little fault to find, except that the armament is not all that we might expect. But when we go back to our old armourclads or even our middle-aged armourclads, one point is very striking—that next to nothing has been done to bring these ships up to date. Very many, even of our relatively modern battleships, are cumbered with inflammable fittings, wooden cabins, chart houses, bridges and so forth. In view of the lessons of *Santiago* and the *Yalu* this wood ought to be removed, but year after year passes and it is allowed to remain. It is said, indeed, on the strength of the *Belleisle* experiments, that it is not really a danger where there is a good fire-service; but the fact remains that foreign navies, where they have not already eliminated the wood in their old ships, are eliminating it now with all possible despatch. Ship after ship in the French, Russian and German fleets is being reconstructed, and the wood in each case is being removed. Surely this action of other Admiralties suggests that our deductions from a single experiment may have been incorrect. And if so, where shall we be? Let it be remembered that the ten battleships of the Naval Defence Act (*Royal Sovereign* and *Centurion* classes) are crammed with wood and have wooden decks, in great part not laid upon steel; and that the nine battleships of the *Admiral*, *Sanspareil* and *Edinburgh* class are just as bad. That makes nineteen nominally modern ships in which this serious defect occurs.

All these nineteen ships need thorough repair and alteration. They are well worth it, though the cost would be high, possibly reaching 4,000,000*l.* We cannot afford to let our vessels go to ruin or become obsolete; we must copy foreign Powers and see that such vessels are kept in thorough repair. In the French fleet immense sums have been spent on reconstruction, with the result that the older French ships are thoroughly efficient. Our First Lords never allow for this in calculations, nor does the public realise that, as between battleship and battleship of the same date, reconstruction may make all the difference in the world.

As for the muzzleloader-armed ships, of which, to the Admiralty's shame, there are still no less than twenty-two upon the effective list, the newest of them was laid down about 1876, and therefore, under the sensible German twenty-five years rule, they must be pronounced inefficient, even apart from their armament. They are now so old and so helpless in every respect—as the *Belleisle* experiment showed—that they are not worth the outlay of a penny. Quite characteristically the Admiralty is preparing to waste 10,000*l.* on reboiling one of these precious craft. They are sound, no doubt, and should not be broken up, but they should be struck off the effective list and placed in our commercial harbours to perform the function of scarecrows and keep off stray raiders in war.

Are the dockyards and naval bases adequate and properly equipped? To this question an unhesitating negative must be returned, so far as our home-yards are concerned. Though immense works have been carried out at our yards, these works have not kept pace with the requirements of a growing navy. At Portsmouth, for example, the vessels docked here increased from 88 to 182 in fifteen years, but within that time the docks have only increased from 13 to 15. The plant, appliances, and machinery are nowhere up-to-date, nowhere adequate to the needs of the fleet. Taking Portsmouth, for example, there is still no electric light in the yard; the machinery is much of it twenty or even thirty years out of date; there is a general want of the most modern machine tools. First Lords complain that they cannot get skilled workmen, but they can, with perfect ease, acquire modern machinery. It is simply a question of money. Moreover, all experience proves that it is true economy always to 'scrap' your old machinery, and to work with the best and newest tools. As it is, the yard is unable at one and the same time to keep existing ships in order and to build new ships rapidly. At this moment there are no less than fifteen destroyers waiting repairs, and all in their present condition inefficient. Year by year arrears are accumulating, and when the day of battle comes, our material will be found in bad order.

At Devonport and Chatham matters are as bad. Devonport has only one jetty alongside which a vessel can ship her heavy equipment.

The narrow entrance of Keyham Basin prevents a modern first-class battleship from being berthed in the basin. At Pembroke things are even worse. The plant of the dockyard when last I saw it, two years ago, evidently dates back some thirty years. When two ships are building, one has to lie out in the stream, with the consequences that the cost of construction is increased and enormous delay incurred, as the workmen and material have to be ferried backward and forward between the ship and the shore. Yet Pembroke is admirably situated. Strategically, it is as near Brest as is Portsmouth, while it is close to the coal and iron fields of South Wales. It has not one single dock capable of taking a modern battleship or even our modern types of large armoured cruisers. The existing dock there should be enlarged without delay and duplicated.

In the Mediterranean, at Malta and Gibraltar, much is being done. But there is reason to fear that at Gibraltar the new works have not been well planned, while our Admirals on the station want a new fortified base at Alexandria in the Eastern Mediterranean, where we have no accommodation of any kind.

At home either we must have a new dockyard, preferably on the north-east coast, or the present yards must be greatly extended. It should be noted that in Germany immense dockyard extensions are in progress, which, as M. Lockroy remarks in his interesting *Lettres sur la Marine Allemande*, are to keep pace with the increase of the fleet. Here, as usual, we have German method, German foresight, and German thoroughness. 'The workshops,' says M. Lockroy, 'are supplied with electrical power and the *most modern tools*.' Ten thousand men either are at work now, or will shortly be at work, on the new docks, basins, and workshops to be constructed at Kiel. The increase in plant and accommodation is not postponed haphazard-wise till the fleet has outgrown the dockyards. But then Germany has a policy which is framed and carried out by experts.

Before passing from material to *personnel*, the necessity of a new naval programme, spread over several years and similar in all vital respects to the German Navy Act of 1900, must be urged. Such a programme would make provision for *ersatzbauten*, or 'substitute ships,' built to replace each battleship that has attained an age of twenty-five years, and *neubauten*, or 'additional ships,' constituting a numerical addition to the navy. A definite programme tells contractors and makers of armour what to expect and prepare for, and if the money is voted *en bloc*, to be defrayed by a series of annual payments, with the stipulation that sums not expended one year are to be carried forward to the next, and not returned to the Treasury, there is no risk of 'savings.' Rapid and economical construction is facilitated. The arguments against such a programme will not bear close inspection.

III. PERSONNEL

There has been no striking change in the *personnel* of the fleet during the past year. The education and training are much what they were, though an endless correspondence in the press proves that the modern navy is not contented with either. A praiseworthy attempt is being made to provide a new Naval Reserve, which will be mainly composed of long-service seamen. Dockyard employes are also to be enrolled in this reserve, though obviously not one of them can be spared from the dockyards in war. Indeed Portsmouth, Chatham, Devonport, and Pembroke will all want more skilled artisans. Nor can any reserve provided by a long-service system be a large one. To obtain an adequate reserve we must have short service somewhere and in some degree. The objection of naval officers to it is quite intelligible. With the example of the army before them, they may be excused for dreading a lowering of the term of service. It would mean simple disaster were our fleets to be manned in peace or war by weedy striplings and immature youths.

But a reserve and a large reserve we must have. It should not be less in number than 100,000, and it is doubtful if even that would suffice for the requirements of a great war. The Naval Reserve may be expected to yield, with all deductions, about 25,000 men; the new 'Fleet Reserve,' perhaps 10,000 to 15,000 available efficient. Taking the more conservative figure, we have a deficiency of 65,000 men. Now it seems to the writer that short service might be tentatively introduced in the reorganised Reserve Fleet, of which the need has already been pointed out. With six battleships and as many cruisers in commission in this fleet, about 4,000 seamen and stokers would be required. Might not these be raised on a basis of three years' active service, and seventeen years in the reserve? If 2,000 more were kept ashore in the depôts for a thorough preliminary instruction, such as the recruits of the German Navy receive, that would give 6,000 short-service men, or a yearly levy of 2,000. The efficient reserve, all under forty, would number about 30,000. This short-service force should be kept distinct from the rest of the navy, with a separate port—preferably the new dockyard, which, we have seen, is much needed. The ships in which the short-service men embarked would be employed on the home station. If the scheme were tested and proved a failure, it could be dropped—though I should note that German experience shows that very fair seamen can be made, with care on the part of officers, of three-years men. We have seen, too, that the Channel Squadron is at present largely manned by very young seamen, who are, at any rate on paper, considered efficient. No doubt this scheme would introduce complications, but at least it would give a considerable trained

reserve. If it proved a success, its total could be doubled, when we should have our 100,000 reservists.

Nor should the resources which Canada and Australia offer for the recruiting of a good Naval Reserve be overlooked for a moment longer. From these quarters we could draw 10,000 to 20,000 excellent men.

It is essential that the total of trained officers should be increased with all possible rapidity. France, Russia, and Germany are all adding largely to their total of officers; indeed Germany proposes inside the next twenty years to double her staff. This she will do, as she does all things, quietly and systematically.

Another essential is to excite the officers who command in our navy to think and write on professional questions. Scharnhorst has said that 'the test of a great army [or navy] in peace-time is its output of professional literature.' Tried by that test—which is, be it remembered, that selected by a great master of war, whether on the practical or theoretical side—we do not make a good showing. There is no technical naval periodical in England corresponding to the German semi-official *Marine Rundschau*.

Of our navy it may truly be said, in Scharnhorst's words, describing the Prussian army on the eve of Jena, that 'It is animated by the best spirit; courage, ability, nothing is wanting. But it will not, it cannot, in the condition in which it is, do anything great or decisive.'

The moral is plain. We must have organisation, carried out by an organiser who understands war. It is at Whitehall, at Downing Street, that the real fault is to be found. Responsibility when it is 'spread' spells unreadiness and inefficiency. Germany, says M. Lockroy, 'views war as she does one of the national industries. She nurses her navy as though it were a commercial undertaking . . . what dominates our attention is not so much the number of her ships or the size of her arsenals, as her application of method to the acquisition of naval supremacy.'

Let us not be ashamed to copy her and improve upon her. What we require is not so much a vast outlay, as better method, more business-like procedure, the wisest use of the great advantages which unquestionably we possess.

6

H. W. WILSON.

THE DRAMA IN THE ENGLISH PROVINCES

WHEN I became a provincial playgoer in 1870 the old circuit system had been dead for nearly a generation, and the stock company system was already dying. A very vivid and charming little miniature sketch of the old circuit actor is to be found in M. Filon's account of the English stage reprinted from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. But the strolling player perished before my play-going days, or lingered only in the provincial stock company that was itself on its last legs. It was, of course, the railway that did to death both the old circuit actor and the settled provincial stock company.

I was able to watch the transition in the provinces from the stock company to our present system of travelling companies moving from town to town and playing only one piece. For a year or two almost every evening saw me regularly in the pit of the theatre of a Northern manufacturing town. The company was probably an average stock company of the time. There was the 'leading' man, the 'leading juvenile' man, the 'heavy' man, the 'low' comedian, the 'old' man, the 'first utility' man, the 'general utility' man, and the 'light comedy' man. This latter performer did also in his own single person body forth those types of male humanity whose character, bearing, and form, clearly proclaimed them to be 'walking gentlemen'—that is, when suitably attired in woefully-fitting lavender trousers and a pair of split and dirty lemon kid gloves.

To turn to the other sex, there were the 'leading lady,' the 'heavy' lady (whose appearance provoked a sorry obvious jest), the 'old' woman, the 'general utility' lady, the 'chambermaid,' and the 'walking' lady, whose style, manner, and dress, displayed a large imaginative caprice, and were a fitting pendant to those of the 'walking gentleman,' though indeed they were not readily recognisable as appropriate to any 'lady' who ever 'walked' our own or any other land. It will thus be seen that the company contained representatives of those twelve or fourteen everlasting types into which, according to the delightful classification of our English

theatre, our Fashioner is always moulding and baking His creatures as if He were some decrepit old potter whose invention had decayed.

There was not, so far as I can remember, a 'singing chamber-maid.' Heyday! Here's a tempting mad-cap theme! Hist!

Ravishing and desirable visitant to this sad earth, thou twinkling shaft of sunlight shot across our northern gloom, would that troops and troops of thy saucy sisterhood skipped everywhere amongst us, and everywhere infected and inflamed our stubborn bleak commercialism till it danced and sang in rampant unison with thee, even to the scandalous verge of making England merry again, thou impudent charmer! Alas, what boots it, songstress, to sing thy praises! Thou art not any past or present actuality of English life! Thou art not to be found carolling on thy errands along the corridors of any company hotel! Thou art a phantom of the footlights and theatrical advertisements, from whence thou art shabbily vanishing or hast shabbily vanished. Adieu, figment!

In addition to representatives of those twelve or fourteen well-defined types, into which, according to theatrical phraseology, it has pleased Providence to cast humanity, there were two leading supers who were occasionally augmented for special productions. These two supers were always present as the main body and trusty henchmen of Richard's or Macbeth's army, or the chief guests in a modern drawing-room. One of them was very fallow, with thick black hair and a low forehead. His only expression was a determined savage scowl, which might indeed have been of some happy service on those occasions when the business of the scene naturally required an onlooker to regard it with that expression of countenance. But unfortunately for his usefulness even at such rare moments, his scowl was always directed at the audience, and I never detected in him the least approach to any interest in the performance. The other leading super was a large sandy man, with an amiable moon-face and a pronounced squint. So far as the shifting and impenetrable vagaries of his glance allowed one to guess what was passing in his mind, he appeared to take a fatherly benevolent, but somewhat contemptuous, interest in what was being enacted before him. He gave one the notion that his mind was a storehouse of futile irrelevancies, and his peculiar expression, added to his wonderful (apparent) power of focussing his vision simultaneously on the middle occupant of the gallery and on the bald spot in the conductor's coiffure beneath him, conspired harmoniously with his fellow-super's scowl to convict every scene in which they appeared of candid and whimsical imposture. In saying this I do not mean to imply that their efforts achieved a different result from that usually achieved by provincial supers, or even by far more exalted performers in London; but only that their respective methods of obtaining that result were noticeably original and unique.

To sum up the company, it was fairly capable in domestic and legitimate drama. The leading performers 'knew their business,' and while I cannot say that I ever saw a great performance, I certainly saw many sound and respectable ones. The piece was changed two or three times a week, but the *répertoire* remained the same to some extent during the season. *The Man in the Iron Mask*, *Leah*, *The Corsican Brothers*, *The Porter's Knot*, and other and more bloodthirsty melodramas constantly changed places with *The Daughter of the Regiment*, *A Hundred Thousand Pounds*, and *Hamlet*. Sometimes leading performers like Toole and Sothern came and brought a new piece for trial, filling in the smaller parts from the local company. A very unequal and slovenly performance, except in the leading parts, was generally the result.

The scenery and furniture were atrociously bad. A shabby orange-coloured chamber nightly challenged every law of architecture, decoration, and archæology; brazenly pretending to be a mid-Victorian parlour to-night, while last evening it had claimed to be Joseph Surface's library, and the night before it had ambitiously posed as Portia's palace. A kitchen scene played much the same pranks with architectural possibility and human credulity; while the Forest of Arden might perhaps have passed muster as the ramparts of Elsinore if it had not been unblushingly announced the week before as the 'Exterior of a Cottage at Clapham;' at the same time showing a background of wonderful rocky sea ravine such as no Rosalind nor any maiden of South London has ever gazed upon.

No performance of any striking merit stands out in my provincial remembrances apart from the occasional visits of London performers. Already the stock company was doomed. Travelling companies playing the Robertson comedies of *Caste*, *School*, and *Ours*, had lately visited the leading towns, and it soon became evident that this was to be the coming form of organisation for the drama in the provinces. From that time to this the provincial stock companies have dwindled in numbers, importance, and ability, as the travelling companies have correspondingly increased in the same regards, and have virtually taken possession of the whole field. Many tears are continually shed over the decease of the stock provincial company; many cries are continually raised for its resurrection. There are good reasons for lamenting it; there are good reasons for wishing its restoration—if that were possible. But in considering the future of the drama in the provinces, the wiser plan is to plainly recognise that the old provincial stock company is dead. Killing time has glared upon it, and it lies a veritable corpse before our eyes.

A very interesting correspondence concerning the provincial drama appeared last summer in the pages of the weekly newspaper, *The Clarion*. Mr. William Archer, Mr. Courtneidge (the manager of the two leading Manchester theatres), Mr. Thompson (the critic of *The*

Clarion), Mr. George Bernard Shaw, and many others, continued the discussion for several weeks. Much truth was raked out, many complaints were made, some suggestions were started, and nothing was done.

The general situation was well described by Mr. Courtneidge in a very able letter, showing great knowledge of the subject, great enthusiasm for the drama, and a willingness to join in any practical scheme for its betterment. To put the matter as briefly as possible, the main facts are as follows :

The first thing to note in the situation is the great and continued increase of country people who constantly visit London. Not only our leading families, not only the professional classes, but almost every tradesman goes up to London every year, for periods varying from some days to some months. This means that English play-going has become largely centralised in London. Our long runs in town are largely supported by the constant flux of country visitors. Country people do most of their play-going in London, and tend to have their tastes and judgments formed by London standards. The plays that obtain sufficient success in London to be sent into the country have been already seen in their best presentment by most of the regular provincial play-goers. And unless a play has some feature of absorbing interest it is rarely visited in the country by those who have already seen it in London to better advantage, or to what they suppose to be better advantage.

The large towns, eight or ten in number, are visited nearly every year by some of the leading London managers—Irrving, Tree, Alexander, Hare, the Kendals, the Cyril Maudes, and others. These leading managers take their London productions and their London performers—at any rate in the leading parts. There is generally a little reduction in the salary lists, a little weakening of the London cast, but the performance is not markedly inferior to the one given in town.

These visits of the leading actors are almost always crowded, and bring a very substantial profit to both London and local manager. And these few weeks, at most some six or eight in the autumn, are almost the only profitable ones in the whole year for our leading country managers—apart from pantomime and musical comedy. There is perhaps a chance successful week or so of a London success, a popular melodrama, or an extraordinary farce like *Charley's Aunt*.

It is not worth while to quibble about words, but these visits of London managers can hardly be counted as the provincial drama. When the whole cast and scenery of the Lyceum or Her Majesty's are taken to the Theatre Royal, Manchester, it is virtually London play-going that is being done in Manchester.

The annual pantomime, extending from Christmas to some time

in February according to the degree in which it hits local taste, is the country manager's sheet-anchor. It is generally a formless perversion of a fairy tale with the latest popular music-hall songs introduced; it often gives great scope to singers, dancers, and variety performers to show cleverness in their different ways. It is lavishly and generously, if not tastefully, mounted. It certainly amuses the hard-worked populations of our large towns, and is usually as free from offence as it is from any pretence to intellectual effort either in the writing or acting. It cannot be considered as drama; it has no relation to drama, and its structure seems to grow more formless each year. But without the profits brought in by this annual pantomime it is likely that half our provincial theatres would have to close in bankruptcy. The local pantomimes are largely attended by all classes of playgoers, even those who rarely go into the local theatre at other times.

After the few weeks of the London managers, and the pantomimes, those devoted to musical comedy are the most profitable. Very large sums are taken by musical comedies, which seem to succeed in proportion as they make no demands upon the intelligence or emotions of the spectator. The musical comedies are supported by the same artists who play in the pantomimes, and very often the same songs and catchwords and tricks are introduced. The whole entertainment is of the same order as the local pantomime, appeals to the same tastes, and meets the same widespread demand for entertainment outside the drama. They afford clever singers and dancers the means of displaying their art, and give opportunities for much buffoonery to the comedians. But, again, they cannot be said to have any connection with the drama. They are entertainments pure and simple. They succeed because they lack the first essential quality of drama—that of painting humanity. They exist not to show life, but to take the spectators away from it.

Outside the upper, professional, and middle classes who constantly visit London, there are vast crowds of the lower classes who remain all the year in the large towns and who have a rough uncultivated love for the drama. Melodrama, therefore, still fitfully flourishes in the provinces, chiefly in the second or third class theatres. Considerable fortunes have been made, I believe, by pieces which have never been heard of in London, while some old London successes still make profitable appeals to simple country audiences in the pit and gallery. But melodrama is apparently dead in London; and there is no very hopeful outlook for it in the provinces.

There is still perhaps a considerable future for gospel melodrama in the provinces. Many years ago I pointed out that a huge fortune was waiting for anyone who would teach the British public to save their souls by the help of religious melodrama instead of by religious stories. I did not misjudge my countrymen. And there are still, I

believe, rich veins of superstition and fear and ignorance to be worked in the same field by anyone who cares to grub in that soil. But melodrama, whether of the gospel or police variety, is not a form of dramatic art that national pride can take any great delight in fostering among the populace.

Apart from the forms of theatrical entertainment which I have hastily run through, there are one or two companies playing a *répertoire* of Shakespeare and the old comedies. Mr. Benson has made gallant and successful efforts for Shakespeare and the old comedies in all our provincial towns; and Mr. Ben Greet has also deservedly gained a high reputation in a like enterprise. Both have offered a valuable training school for recruits, and both have furnished performers of marked ability to the London stage.

Lastly, there are the companies that are organised and drilled in London to go out and play exclusively one of the latest successes produced at such London theatres as Wyndham's, the St. James's, the Haymarket, the Garrick, and the Criterion. They meet with varied success. A piece that wins a great London success is almost sure to have some vogue and to make some money in the provinces. But, as a rule, unless a piece is a very pronounced success in London, it will almost certainly lose money in the provinces. For a piece of this kind needs very finished and trained acting for its adequate representation, and this under the present circumstances of our stage it is almost impossible to get. As soon as an actor obtains any reputation he tries to get a London engagement, and will not go into the provinces except under necessity.

I have now given a hasty bird's-eye view of the drama in the English provinces. I have purposely omitted the leading factor in the whole situation. The chief thing to take into account is the recent erection everywhere of huge music-halls, which have everywhere gained popularity and pecuniary success as the theatres have declined. Many of the performers at the music-halls are the same who appear in pantomime and musical comedies; and while the more popular entertainments at the theatres have gradually become more and more like the entertainments at a music-hall, the entertainments at the music-hall have included short sketches, plays, and duologues, and in this respect have made approaches towards the drama.

Leaving out this dominant factor of the situation, which I shall deal with by-and-by, we may proceed to sum up the drama's gains and losses in the English provinces during the past generation.

We have almost lost the art of representing our great national masterpieces. The absence of schools of training and practice has left our actors with a slovenly amateurish elocution, and a want of method and sustained power to grapple with great parts in such a way as to make them interesting or even credible to an audience. A generation or two ago, many of our provincial companies could

have given at short notice a better *all-round* representation of most of Shakespeare's plays than could be possibly obtained to-day, even with London performers to choose from. Correlatively, we have lost amongst our provincial audiences all care for their local theatre as an institution of their own, all pride in their local favourite performers, and I believe (though I should be glad to find myself refuted) much enthusiasm for Shakespeare and a high level of poetic acting has evaporated. So much for the poetic drama in the provinces.

On turning to the drama of modern English life, I think we may, on the whole, claim a distinct advance all round. It must be borne in mind that there are, and can be, only two leading branches of English drama—our great poetic drama, and the serious, and so far as may be realistic, drama of modern life. By 'serious' I do not mean 'dull'—I use the word as opposed to farce and burlesque, and all irrational and nondescript forms of theatrical entertainment. There are, of course, large delightful realms of farce and fantasy and burlesque which may well furnish genuine examples of dramatic art; but farce, burlesque, and fantasy can only flourish as auxiliary and supplementary forms; they can never be the mainstay of a national drama.

These two main branches of modern and poetic drama are distinct arts. They do not make the same demands on the performer, and it is rare, almost impossible in England, to find an actor or an actress who excels in both. In France, where the actor's training is more thorough and comprehensive, many of the leading performers are equally at home in poetic and modern drama.

To return. If in the provinces we have had a very heavy loss approaching to bankruptcy in the poetic drama, I think we can claim a modest and growing profit in many items on the modern side. It is very small and precarious, no doubt, but I believe there is a distinct gain.

To begin with the acting. Doubtless we cannot count so many good performers in scenes of rough pathos and broad comedy, but as the future advance of our drama does not lie in those directions, this is no great loss. We have many more and many better actors who can interpret scenes that need subtlety and refinement, parts that need exact and definite characterisation, who can deliver ordinary modern dialogue with some naturalness and point, and whose general behaviour and method of pronunciation in a drawing-room are not modelled on those of the old Adelphi guests.

In general cultivation and intelligence, in manners and bearing, our present rate of young actors is out of all measure superior to that of last generation. All duly qualified students of human stupidity will surely pronounce that the stupidity of the old actor, the actor who 'knows his business' and knows nothing else, is the most

grievous and malignant form of the perennial malady of our race. A young Englishman fresh from Oxford or Cambridge is much pleasanter and more ductile material for an author and stage-manager to handle than the old actor of last generation. I think the *ensemble* of a provincial performance by what is called the No. 1 Company of a London comedy success would place in a very unfavourable light any representation of a modern drama or comedy by a provincial stock company of the last generation, could they be simultaneously compared.

With regard to mounting and *mise-en-scène*, we may claim an immense improvement over the productions of last generation. In place of the ludicrously inappropriate scenery I have described and which had to do duty for all the various productions of the season our best travelling companies take their own scenery with them from town to town. And this scenery is in most cases a copy of the London production, made specially strong to withstand the wear and tear. Again, in the matter of costume, the dresses are usually copies of the London production. In modern comedies the ladies' dresses for the No. 1 companies are often made to fit the performers by the same fashionable dressmakers who made the original dresses. The wardrobe of a provincial theatre a generation ago was a mere storehouse of dirty and tawdry incongruities that were equally ready at all times to mis-fit all plays and all performers, and to assist the scenery in quaintly confounding chronology and destroying illusion. The mechanical appliances in all leading provincial theatres have also been wonderfully developed, multiplied, and improved during the same time. On all these counts we score immense gains.

It is true that the supply of competent actors and actresses for the provincial companies is lamentably deficient. This is accounted for by the unwillingness of performers of any repute to leave London and by the absence of any opportunity of practice and training for our recruits. If I am able to claim that our leading provincial companies give a tolerable representation of a modern comedy, it is not because many of the performers know how to act, but because most of them are simply playing themselves. Our modern English drama is realistic and individualistic, not classic and declamatory. Now, granted a good performance of a play in London (and I have been lucky enough to secure far more than this for those pieces of mine produced by Charles Wyndham)—granted a good original London performance, and a crowd of untrained raw provincial performers, the task is to pick out of these hundreds of aspirants just those who have some little experience and natural capacity, and whose figure, manner, and general bearing most nearly agree with the respective characters of the play. We then set them to watch the London performance and, so far as they can, to reproduce it. By

this means we can generally secure a tolerable representation for the country tour. And I think that in this way the provincial public is better served to-day with regard to modern plays than it was served under the old stock company system.

But it is a bad system for the actor: it keeps him wooden and inflexible; it deadens his sense, his enthusiasm, and his talent; it leaves him an amateur at the end of his days. I recently heard of a young man who took lessons for a year in elocution; he then obtained a part of three lines in a provincial company. This he played for another year; he then shifted and obtained another small part, which I believe he is still playing. And this is typical of what is taking place everywhere amongst all our young actors and actresses. This is our present system for teaching one of the subtlest, most intellectual, and most difficult of arts. Compare the case I have mentioned with the average case of the young actor who entered the profession thirty or forty years ago, and constantly had to play a dozen different parts a week.

This, then, is the crying evil to be remedied. Both Mr. Courtneidge as manager, and Mr. Thompson as critic, struck their finger on the place in calling out for some school of training and practice for our young generation of actors. They did indeed also lament the present dearth of new plays and the absence of any school of practice for young playwrights. But this is a far wider question and is not essentially a provincial matter. It is indeed the most vital question that can be raised in respect of our national drama; but it would be out of place to deal with it here—except to say that the present condition of our national drama is due to the abstention of literary men from the theatre, and to their contemptuous ignorance of the necessary craft and *technique*.

But the absence of a school of training for actors and actresses may perhaps be considered as having a direct concern with the provincial drama, since, until the present generation, the provinces have always been the recognised training-ground for London.

Mr. Courtneidge, who has the double advantage of having been an actor trained in the old school and of being a manager in the present school, formulates the outline of a scheme for a stock company to visit the leading towns, and to be established and supported by our leading provincial managers. If such an organisation could be formed, I think it might be of great service and influence, as indeed, must be any well-trained company performing intellectual plays. He proposes that this stock company should stay several weeks in each of the large towns and play a *répertoire* of old and new plays. I think there might be room for such a company, and if it were well trained and directed it could, I think, be made to pay. But the scheme seems to be attended with many difficulties, and I question whether it would altogether meet our crying demand—that

is, for a school of constant practice *before the public* for our young untrained actors. Mr. Courtneidge withholds the details of his scheme, but if he can formulate it and bring it into being with the help of his brother-managers, I shall be ready to lend it all the assistance in my power. I willingly acknowledge the evil to actors and public of long runs, and if another system can be started which will be of greater advantage to the drama, I will gladly help to build up that system.

But I do not see how Mr. Courtneidge's proposal can be made to fit in with present conditions and tendencies. What place in such a scheme would be taken by a new play by a recognised dramatist?

For instance, Mr. Percy Hutchison sent out *The Liars* with Mr. Henry Neville in the leading part, and with a company as good as could be induced to go into the provinces, with scenery and dresses copied from the London production. How could our good careless master the public be better served, with respect to this or any other modern play, under Mr. Courtneidge's scheme?

If the provincial playgoing public could be induced to come and see a modern comedy with half the zest and in half the numbers that they flock to a pantomime or a musical comedy, we might by raising the salaries induce better London actors to come into the provinces in the smaller parts, and thus give an all-round performance that should be in no wise inferior to the London one. That must, of course, be the aim of every provincial manager. The limit of excellence in the provinces, so far as my productions are concerned, shall be the point at which it ceases to pay to send out the best available London performers. I wish provincial playgoers could be brought to believe that a country performance by carefully selected performers may be as well worth seeing as the more highly favoured London one.

I hope Mr. Courtneidge and his brother-managers may be persuaded to formulate his scheme and give it a trial. Meantime, perhaps, something might be done to form a school of public practice for young actors, by fostering the growth of under-companies in connection with some of our theatres, both in the provinces and in London. Manchester was long known as a training school for actors. It has great memories and great traditions. The Theatre Royal and the Prince's are both under the direction of Mr. Courtneidge, and are therefore both available for the working out of the suggestion which I venture, with many misgivings, to throw out. It is a plan, however, that should perhaps be first tried in London. If found successful there, it could be adapted to our large towns.

There are always a large number of aspirants to the stage of both sexes. A competent stage manager and teacher of elocution should be appointed and well paid by the leading London managers and authors to examine the qualifications of all who care to present them-

selves for stage tuition. Many aspirants would perhaps be weeded out at the first trial, while the doubtful ones would be held in suspense for future probation. Rehearsals of standard poetic and modern plays should be relentlessly and vigorously pursued with these raw amateurs, either at some theatre not temporarily occupied or by turns at our regular theatres. One of the more lowly rented theatres should be taken, as it could, for a comparatively small sum, and weekly or bi-weekly morning performances should be given with a free entrance to the public to all the cheaper parts. A small sum might be charged for admission to the better parts in order to help towards the expenses. But the tuition should be free, and there should, of course, be no salary to the actor. From the great number of aspirants presenting themselves, we might hope to get a fairly high level of raw talent. Aspirants should be allowed two or three essays before they were finally dismissed as incapable or accepted as students. Being accepted, they should then be called upon to sign an undertaking to undergo a certain course of study, and in return for their training to pay to the institution a tolerably high percentage of their salary during the first years of their engagement on the regular stage. This latter clause should be made very stringent, and all London and country managers would be expected to co-operate with the institution in working it so that the scheme might tend to become self-supporting. The payments of the public to the better places in the house would also contribute to the same end. But we could not hope that the school would defray its expenses for many years to come. It would have to be cordially and unreservedly supported by our leading London managers, actors, and authors. Our leading actors might be asked to attend rehearsals, and occasionally to give lessons. The managers might be asked to lend appropriate scenery, and authors might be asked to place some of their older and better known plays at the disposal of the institution. There is no doubt that the initial expenses would be considerable, and that there must be a constant outlay for some years to come. But I think we should all find ourselves amply repaid in time by the number of fresh recruits that would thus be brought to our aid. The *matinées* should be given on Mondays and Thursdays, the days that do not interfere with the ordinary theatre *matinée*. The scheme should be made thoroughly known, so that public interest might be roused and sustained in it. And doubtless, if it could once be started, and a fair level of efficiency attained, a good audience might be expected on each occasion. The ordinary public should be admitted free, due care being taken to exclude constant loafers. Of course our recruits would have to live while they were learning their business, but so does a young man who gives four or five years of his life to learn the far easier craft of carpentry. And the fact that they were associated with the school ought to give them the first call on

managers for the parts of supernumeraries and very small parts at our regular theatres.

The scheme could not be put on its legs without the cordial co-operation of all our managers and without a handsome subscription to start with. But the sum to be provided would be a mere nothing compared with that required to endow a national theatre; while, if the scheme should be found to work, a more ambitious undertaking might be grafted upon it. If my plan should be thought worth consideration, it might at first be taken in hand and hammered into shape by a small committee of experts. Perhaps Sir Squire Bancroft, who since his retirement has so generously given his time and skill to befriend the theatrical profession, might be disposed to preside over the committee, which should also contain three or four practical men with leisure. These should appoint a general manager to work incessantly and exclusively to carry out the details of the scheme. Rehearsals should be conducted with the driving insistence of a drill-sergeant. There could be no hope of carrying the thing further towards success without a resolute, capable, and clear-sighted organiser. And where is such a man to be found? Provided we could lay hands on him and make his position permanent, profitable, and honourable, I think some good might come of my suggestion. But, as I say, I throw it out with great diffidence, and only in the absence of any alternative scheme for meeting our most crying need—a training school for young actors *before the public*. I need not say that I do not wish for any personal control, direct or indirect, over the institution. But if it can be brought into existence I will gladly be responsible for my full share, and more than my full share, of the expenses of the experiment, and I will place at the disposal of the committee any of my plays that may be found useful in the *répertoire*. I feel sure my brother-authors would do no less.

The scheme is, I think, more suitable to London than the provinces, but it could be tried in each of our larger towns. What a chance for a millionaire-philanthropist to provide the necessary expenses, either in London, or in his native Manchester or Birmingham!

But millionaire-philanthropists are shy in coming to the aid of the drama, and prefer to make selfish investments for eternity in another class of spiritual security. Yet I know of no way in which a wealthy man could better serve his fellow-Englishmen and win a lasting renown for himself, than by helping to raise this fine and beautiful art, which, however disabled and disorganised it may be to-day, is yet the prime glory of England in her glorious prime, and is not so atrophied and supine but that it may revive to add another glory to a greater England.

We must not at present expect any aid from municipalities as a body, but perhaps some day it may dawn even upon town councillors that to encourage this most human, civilising, and in the highest sense

educational art, should be as much the business and the ambition of an elected citizen as to lay down drains and build gasworks. Meantime, perhaps, provincial mayors may be entreated to give what encouragement they can to the art of the drama as separate from popular amusement.

And here we are brought round again to the central fact which meets us and blocks the way in every argument and discussion about the English drama. Take up what side of the subject we may, approach it from any point of view, we are quickly brought face to face with this main plain truth—in England the art of drama only exists as the parasite and hanger-on of popular amusement. We have no distinct drama at all. What beginnings or remains of a drama we possess are everywhere entangled with popular amusement. Mr. Cecil Raleigh has recently shown in a letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette* that everywhere popular amusement is choking the drama. In the provinces, as Mr. Courtneidge's letter shows, the leading provincial managers only keep afloat by calling on popular amusement to help them out of their losses on the drama. In London things are a little more hopeful, and we have several flourishing theatres that may claim to be well over the division-line between drama and popular amusement. But even in London the drama leads only a starved apologetic existence compared with popular amusement; and the two things are hopelessly confused in the public mind.

Now, the fact is that the drama and popular amusement are not and never can be the same thing. Their aims, their methods, the kind of pleasure they propose to give, the tastes and moods to which they appeal, the standards by which they should be judged, are totally distinct, in many cases totally opposed. As I have shown above, the form of theatrical entertainment most in vogue and most successful in England to-day is utterly opposed to the primary object of dramatic art—that is, to paint life. This form of entertainment has no relation to life, either real or ideal. This is not to condemn it; it is only to classify it. Looking at the dreary lives of our millions of toilers, and the more dreary lives of our millions of suburban residents, who would wish to deprive them of a bright, harmless, careless evening hour? Who would be so churlish? Who would be so foolish? And nothing can be more gratifying than the marked improvement that has everywhere taken place in the music-hall entertainments, and to which I readily and gladly testify.

But the mischief is that English drama is mainly judged by the test of instant popular amusement, and of course rarely and hardly survives that test. Popular amusement everywhere escapes condemnation and ensures good-will because it frankly pretends only to amuse. The drama is liable to condemnation from both sides; either because

it does not instantly and thoughtlessly amuse, which perhaps it did not set out to do; or because, pretending to be a work of art, it stoops to try and amuse. And between these upper and nether millstones it is ground to death. The remedy is to separate English drama from popular amusement, and to ensure that each shall be judged by its respective and appropriate standards. Does this sound like an invitation to playgoers to come and be bored? Not at all. Look, again, at the population of our great cities—let any Londoner take a journey to any suburb and survey the land and its inhabitants—what fitting punishment should be meted out to the man who with superfluous malice sets out to plaster that dulness with a duller dulness, and daub that drabness with a drowdier drab? Who would be so churlish? Who would be so foolish?

No, this is not an invitation to English playgoers to make their theatres places of boredom. It is an invitation to them to make them places of rational and cultivated delight. In the present confusion in the public mind between the drama and popular amusement lies the root of all our difficulties and embarrassments; in the public recognition that the drama and popular amusement are distinct things lies our only hope of one day possessing a national drama.

Whilst the present confusion reigns all discussions about national theatres, schools of elocution, methods of training, and the like, are mere tinkering. Once let a love and regard for the drama as an intellectual art be kindled amongst English playgoers, and national theatres, municipal theatres, and schools of training will arise quite naturally amongst us.

In 1879 an article by Matthew Arnold in this Review concluded with this appeal to English playgoers: 'The theatre is irresistible! Organise the theatre!'

If a deeply grateful servant of English playgoers for twenty years may be allowed to point out the first step in the organisation of the English drama, it would be in these words: 'Separate your national drama from mere popular amusement; they are both desirable things, but they are not and cannot be the same.'

Let us stick our spades in and dig a deep trench between them, a trench as deep as their very foundations.

HENRY ARTHUR JONES.

IMPERIAL CIVIL SERVICE

A SUGGESTION FROM AUSTRALIA

SOME few months ago Lord Tennyson delivered before the University of Adelaide an address, in the course of which he advised well-educated young Australians to look to the Indian Civil Service as a career, and suggested that the English Government should be asked to afford facilities to assist them. Considerable attention was drawn to the speech throughout Australasia, and especially in University circles. As a consequence, a petition has gone home from the governing bodies and the professors of Australasian Universities, asking that opportunity might be offered to candidates in Australasia to compete for appointments in the Higher Imperial Service, including the Civil Service of India. At present, of course, such candidates can compete at the examinations held in London, but first they must at their own charges visit England. A young man must feel very confident of himself and of his own intellectual powers if he lifts his anchor in Australia or New Zealand to trust himself upon such an uncertain sea. He must also have at command a supply of ready money, which our ablest young men not infrequently lack.

Commissions in the army and cadetships in the navy have long been offered to Australasian candidates, and no one can doubt that the boys who have taken them have rendered a good account of themselves. But in the present case the request is of a somewhat different nature. It is not asked that a limited number of appointments in the Indian Civil Service or in the Higher Home Service be set apart for the use of Australasian candidates. For that the petitioners do not hold that they have any right to ask. They readily allow that such a concession would break down the sacred principle of perfectly open competition, which has long been the glory of the Indian Civil Service and is now of the offices in England that range themselves in line with it in the matter of competition. Let the appointments go to the ablest, but let there be facilities for those at a distance to prove whether they fall among the ablest.

The method is that of simultaneous examination in England and at certain selected places in the colonies. The only change in connection with the examination would be that the examiners would be

required to set their papers a little earlier, perhaps five weeks. The papers of questions would then be sent out under seal to responsible persons in the colonies, where they would be answered under precisely similar conditions to those in London. Answers would be returned, likewise under seal, and would reach the examiners in England probably before they had quite finished the task of examining the answers written in London.

Candidates from Australasia ask very little—only the opportunity of serving our common Empire. The request must commend itself to those who govern, unless the difficulty be represented as too great. Difficulties, especially unreal difficulties, vanish when looked fairly in the face.

The principle of local examinations is so thoroughly understood in England that it would seem quite superfluous to dwell upon its methods, were it not for the fact that the Civil Service Commissioners, who are likely to urge a *non possumus* to this request, have not been in the habit of conducting them. They may urge that it is impossible, when it is not even difficult. At Oxford and at Cambridge local examinations are thoroughly well known. At the University of Melbourne, year by year, certain examinations are held at distant centres, and no difficulty has ever occurred. Papers travel from Melbourne to Perth in Western Australia, have travelled as far north as Rockhampton on the tropic of Capricorn, and almost every year go as far as Brisbane; nor does calamity or difficulty arise. The London University used to hold examinations in these colonies for its degrees, until such time as it was thought the Australian Universities were strong enough, and no difficulty arose. The University of New Zealand appoints all its examiners in England, and in connection with their examination there has once happened the only real difficulty—viz. shipwreck. But shipwrecks are rare. It may be asked what would be done in case the answers, on the way to England, were lost in a ship that suffered total wreck. The papers can only then be treated as non-existent. Calamity has befallen the candidate, but he cannot be said to have won a place among the candidates who succeeded. If the Civil Service Commissioners really wish, the thing can be done. We desire to make such an appeal to public opinion that the Commissioners will be forced to do what is merely an act of justice. Equal chance for all the sons of the Empire is what is asked—nothing more, but certainly nothing less; not appointments, but the chance to compete for appointments on level terms.

In Australian University circles there has of late been not a little discussion about this proposal, and one objection raised was that there seemed an absence of reciprocity. We were asking from the Imperial Government something, and giving naught. Did we propose, it was asked, to send the papers for Australian Civil Service examinations home to London for candidates to work there? This

argument fell before a fuller statement of the case. The request is not for the chance to compete in the appointments of the ordinary Home Civil Service. In the local Civil Service of Great Britain there is ~~no~~ ^{no} share to share. Every day it is becoming more and more necessary for public men to discriminate clearly between what is Imperial and what is local. Therein lies the cardinal position of what is known as Imperial Federation. Suppose, for a moment, that such federation, on any lines, were established, a division of the provinces of government must ensue. There would be one marked line of cleavage between that which concerns the whole and that which concerns the parts of the Empire. The following departments of State would go with the Imperial Government: the Foreign Office, the India Office, the control of Army and Navy, the Colonial Office—for there would still be colonies, even if great parts of the Empire, now called colonies, were honoured with a share of the central government. But there would remain Home Affairs, Administration of Justice, Education, Excise, and all the machinery of modern life growing daily more complicated. Thinkers in the colonies hold that men born in Canada, Australasia, and South Africa should have no unnecessary difficulty thrown in the way of their desire to serve the Empire. Given the brains, granted that they can prove their greater fitness, then mere distance ought not to be permitted to stand in the way.

Another objection heard was, 'You ask a vain thing: no one passes unless coached for this particular examination: we have not and we do not want the order of crammers established amongst us.' Is it a vain thing? Is it true that without crammers there is no hope of passing? A study of recent Civil Service reports seems rather to lead to the conclusion that 'the small but well-armed tribe of examiners' is driving the crammers from their strongholds—at all events as far as higher examinations are concerned. If Australasia cannot prepare, if after a few years it is found that there are no successful candidates, a privilege which would be useless could easily be withdrawn. If the Australasian Universities cannot educate candidates up to the necessary standard, it would be well that the fact should be known. We have no desire to live in a fool's paradise. We fancy that we can so educate them, and we ask that we be granted this great assize.

The Empire has been good enough to summon to its work in army and navy the sons of the Empire living afar off. All know that in so doing it has acted wisely, and that the reach of this action is very wide. But why not in the case of civil employ also? Have the colonists right arms, and not brains? Can they fight, and not think? Would it not be good if at the Colonial Office there were 'Indoor Statesmen' (we thank Sir Arthur Helps for the name), who knew intimately about the feelings in the great colonies, whose parents and kinsfolk live in Sydney or in Melbourne? Why should

not young Canadians or New Zealanders hold places in the Foreign Office, the War Office, the Admiralty, if they can win them? Of course the days are gone by when a new Secretary for the Colonies could reply to his Prime Minister urging him to take office, 'I will go upstairs, and get shown these places in a map; 'Is Cape Breton an island?' But even now we sometimes have a feeling half-way between amusement and irritation at 'Melbourne, New South Wales, South Australia,' on a Colonial Office envelope.

The request is not for a multiplicity of examinations such as would lead to confusion.

Some few years ago the famous and difficult examination for the Indian Civil Service was utilised for sundry of the other departments. According to the Report of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners, there is now 'an examination held conjointly for Class I. clerkships in the Home Civil Service, for the Indian Civil Service, and for Eastern Cadetships.' It is to that examination, and to that alone, that admission is asked by means of transmitted papers. It would be easy to mark off such of the Class I. clerkships as are not of an Imperial character.

Most strongly of all is it desired that an avenue may be opened for the young Australasian, often a man of brains and of ready resource, into the noblest service in the world—the Civil Service of India. Here, though I have spoken hitherto rather as a mouth-piece, a personal note may perhaps be permitted me. My father, my grandfathers, uncles, and cousins almost beyond count in the days of 'John Company,' were members of that Service. Having had opportunities to know how excellent the Service is, how it brings out the good in a man and develops a strong and self-reliant character, I cannot but plead that a chance may be granted to the young Australians, whose worth I know, to enter that splendid Service. If a man has any power of governing in him, India is the field to bring it out. Here, in the Australian democracy, other powers are needed for public life. Here, if the man wants to distinguish himself in politics or government, there is but one path—the persuasion of a constituency. This art of persuasion may be entirely lacking, and yet the man may be just such a one as could render excellent service to our dear country as a post in India or in any of the outlying points of the Empire. There is something in the blood. The boys of whom I am thinking are sons or grandsons of those who came out to Australia as pioneers.

With respect to the Indian Service a special difficulty arises—the educated Baboo. It will be urged that if examinations are held in Australia, they must be held in India also. This is another form of the difficulty urged *ad nauseam* against Imperial Federation by that learned historian, the late Mr. E. A. Freeman. The historian of the Norman Conquest used to say, 'But how about the

elector for Masulipatam? Difficulties disappear, again I say, when they are faced. If it is not desired that the natives of India should be admitted to the Service, it would be better to say so than merely to hold the examination in London, in hope that the natives of India will not be able to raise the money to pay for a ticket thither. All must admire the motive of those who threw open the competition to the educated natives of India; but the trouble that arose—not in India only, but in England—over the ‘Ilbert Bill’ of some years ago proves that it is not desired that any large numbers of the natives should hold the reins of government. It would have been better, in my judgment, to have preserved the old distinction between the covenanted and the uncovenanted service, though the names were awkward and unsuitable. The answer to Freeman is that it is proposed to keep the rule of India in the hands of men of the British race; but we in Australia and those in New Zealand claim to be *Britannis Britanniores*. If this be not understood, all talk about the Empire is naught. Seeley laid down the doctrine—now the accepted doctrine—of the *Expansion of England*—or shall we say of Britain? We do not cease to be English or British because we have come overseas. We who live in Sydney or in Melbourne feel that, as far as the Empire as a whole is concerned, we are just like the inhabitants of Middlesex or Yorkshire. The dwellers in New Zealand feel it if anything more strongly, for, if there be measures of zeal, the recent patriotism was perhaps strongest of all at the very Antipodes.

One of the earliest advocates of the system of open competition for the Indian Civil Service was Lord Macaulay. Many years ago he prophesied that the connection between India and the Australasian Colonies would grow closer. In his famous minute on the question whether the higher education of India should be conveyed in English or in the vernacular languages of India, Macaulay advocated that the vehicle of instruction should be English. After praise of the noble literature in the English tongue, praise so strong that Matthew Arnold counted it vainglorious, Macaulay said:

English is likely to become the language of commerce throughout the seas of the East. It is the language of two great European communities which are rising, the one in the South of Africa, the other in Australasia; communities which are every day becoming more important, and more closely connected with our Indian Empire. Whether we look at the intrinsic value of our literature, or at the peculiar situation of this country, we shall see the strongest reason to think that, of all foreign tongues, the English tongue is that which would be the most useful to our native subjects.

This was written sixty-five years ago; and if the arguments were valid then, much more are they now. They were written fifteen years before the discovery of gold, and when the population of Australia, compared with its number at the present day, was a small

handful. The events of the last fifteen months lent an emphasis wholly new to the remark about South Africa, and to the linking of South Africa with the name of Australasia. As ~~one~~ more of the links of Empire, it is asked that sons of the colonies may have the chance of helping in the government of the Empire as a whole.

EDWARD E. MORRIS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE.

VERDI¹

I HAVE been asked to write something on the master who has so lately gone from us.

Verdi is dead! Do not these few words speak to us as no review article can do; and besides, must not Verdi's significance for me personally be without interest to your readers? What then is there left? Biographical notices? They are to be found in every encyclopædia. The slight indication of an instantaneous photograph, seen with the eye of a northerner? For this would be required an objectivity of which I am by no means sure that I am possessed. In spite, however, of all these disadvantages, I will make the attempt.

With Verdi is gone the last of the great ones, and if it were permissible to compare artistic greatness I would say that Verdi was greater than either Bellini, Rossini, or Donizetti. I would go so far, even, as to say that side by side with Wagner he was, on the whole, the greatest dramatist of the century.

But—great, greater, greatest, do not even exist in the realm of art; what is great is great, and there with a full stop. What we all feel at Verdi's death is how infinitely empty at this moment the world seems without him. Where now are to be found among the younger generation of musicians the new, the unwonted, the strongly personal elements of Verdi's art, and these above all in the domain of drama? In Germany, France, England, Russia, Scandinavia? We see them nowhere nowadays, but there are rumours and signs that these qualities are already in swaddling-clothes, and if the signs do not deceive us, it will not be long before the great copying machines after Wagner and Verdi, which are fashionable for the time being, are consigned to an eternal oblivion.

We are waiting for a personality, and that is the reason why Verdi's death fills us with a peculiar sadness. When Gade died here, in Copenhagen, eight years ago, a priest said, at his bier, that his place would soon be filled by another. Such a prodigious piece of stupidity, such a display of an incredibly undeveloped conception of the importance of the beautiful, was it reserved for a Protestant priest to give utterance to! A Roman Catholic priest could not say such a thing, least of all an Italian one, for in Italy all classes of

¹ Translated from the Norwegian by Ethel Hearn.

society, without exception, stand in strikingly direct relations with their great men. They feel a joyous pride in them, and I shall never forget the breath-bated awe with which the Roman man-in-the-street repeats the name of one of his great ones.

It is this relationship, in which Verdi so well understood how to place himself with regard to his countrymen, which dictates his position towards the land of his birth. What he was to his country we can best estimate when we read that after his death the municipal authorities of Milan met in the middle of the night to discuss in what manner honour should be shown to the deceased; and that in Rome, where all the schools gave their scholars holidays until the funeral had taken place, a sitting of the Senate was entirely devoted to the memory of Verdi.

I mention these facts because they show Verdi as a national hero, and it was in this light that the people were accustomed to regard him. A national artist he is to the core, the first and the foremost; as such did he begin, and his great triumphs in youth and in later manhood, among which are the now less known operas *Nabucco* and *I Lombardi*, and a decade later the celebrated *Rigoletto*, *Il Trovatore* and *La Traviata*, indicate all a national standpoint. Then came to pass the remarkable thing that Verdi as a fully matured man greatly widened his horizon, though retaining at the same time what was national in his art: he became a cosmopolitan. Even in the *Traviata* he treads—personal characteristics apart—in many respects, in the footprints of his compatriots. He belonged to a school which in the musical world of our century was treated with contumely. At the Leipzig Conservatorium, in the fifties and sixties, a mention of Verdi's music met with nothing but a contemptuous shrug of the shoulders or the smile of superiority. In learned circles his music was considered meretricious because the national element in it was disregarded, and neither Mendelssohn nor Schumann was able to see Verdi's art as a true expression of the emotional life of his country people. It was Wagner who not only saw this, but who also honestly confessed how much he had learned from the Italians, and chief among them from Bellini. Since those days the Germans have gone so far, even, as to acknowledge that the Verdi of this period should be heard in Italy in order that the truly national element in his art may be fully appreciated.

As far as I know there is now a pause in Verdi's dramatic production; and after this comes, in 1871, *Aida*. What a marvellous development! What significant years in Verdi's inner life does it not betoken! If any one should ask me what school this work belongs to, I could not answer him. It stands upon the shoulders of the art of all time. The newer masters of both France and Germany gave him impulses, but nothing more: *Aida* is a masterpiece in which his own originality is combined with a wide and

sympathetic view of what is best in musical contemporaneity. Verdi the Italian and Verdi the European hold out a hand to one another: the language he here speaks is the language of the world, and we are brought to the country of the composer to understand it. For this reason *Aida* was a success all along the line. His melodies, his harmonies, his treatment of orchestra and choruses, each and all claim the same admiration—only one thing more: the Egyptian local colour. This is not the outcome of a refined technique, but is achieved in great measure by the power his imagination had of transporting itself to the place where the scene of his work is laid. As one example among many, I will merely mention the night scene on the Nile, at the beginning of the third act, in which the flageolet tones of the violoncellos and double-basses, the pizzicato of the violas, and the combined tremolo and arpeggios of the violins accompany an extremely strange flute melody. You are carried away to the solitude of an African night—hear the mysterious and indeterminate sounds peculiar to it. Imagination and technique, in conjunction, have succeeded in producing an effect which is entrancing from its marvellous fullness of character.

After *Aida* appeared *Otello*, in 1887: an interval of sixteen good years, but then this work marks again a new period. In it Verdi is on the highest mountain-top which in his long career it was ever granted him to attain. The long training through different styles of art was a necessity that he might be enabled to create the grand and exalted 'yew' which is the distinguishing feature of this proud work.

Tschaikowsky, in his memoirs, regrets that Verdi reached this height so late in life; he thinks that it might have been attained while imagination still had the elasticity of youth if he had known the contemporary masters of drama in other countries. Unfortunately I have not the book by me, but I remember that Tschaikowsky succeeds very happily in putting his thought into words; but all the same I cannot agree with him. It is not given to us to possess at one and the same time youth and the results of a long life. In order to produce a work such as *Otello* it was necessary for Verdi to undergo his long uninterrupted process of transformation; and the capacity for further development, the depth, the versatility which the ageing master here displays is something astounding. Though he may not be young, still he shows a youthful spirit which can juggle with the fiercest passions of unruly matter. Verdi is not our debtor in anything. There is in his music Shakesperian demoniacality: he shrinks not before such a redoubtable task as the composing of Iago's grand monologue with its gloomy god-denying philosophy of life and death—and how high does he not soar in this scene!

Among the many remarkable things in the instrumentation of this opera is the use made, among other things, of the entire collec-

tive orchestra apparatus for the production of a fear-inspiring pianissimo it is. This I rate I do not remember to have met with it in the master.

It would seem as if *Aida* and *Otello* vied with each other for the first place in Verdi's production. I mentioned the Egyptian colour in *Aida*. I used at one ^{very} ^{way} often to go to the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen, where this opera was admirably rendered and where the orchestra was conducted by Johan Svendsen, and enjoyed the glorious work to the utmost. When, however, the first notes of the overture to the last act were played, I always became aware of a pair of questioning musician's eyes, from the orchestra or the surrounding audience, fixed upon me. On mentioning the matter and asking if any explanation could be given of it, I was told that it was thought that Verdi showed here an intimate acquaintance with the never Norwegian music. How far this is true I cannot tell, but that Verdi did know the Norwegian folk-songs I am prepared, after this overture, to say was a certainty. It is a bit of touching, melancholy music, in which the master, in an admirable manner, lets the wood-wind instruments depict Desdemona's presentiments of death.

Were I to embark upon an exhaustive enumeration of the beauties of this work it would be long before I had finished, but there can be no doubt that *Otello* will stand by the side of *Aida* as a landmark, not only in the work of Verdi, but in the whole dramatic production of our time.

His last opera, *Falstaff*, is the new Verdi down to the ground, but nevertheless it is evident that the modern ideas in it are preached by an old master. His fancy does not take flight as formerly; there is even something short-breathed about it now and again, but of *Falstaff* on the whole it must be said that it contains a true mine of artistic detail.

It is impossible when writing of Verdi's art to omit the mention of his *Requiem* and his *Swan Song*: sacred pieces for choir and orchestra. They represent Roman Catholic culture at its highest, and are full of the deepest and most beautiful inspirations by which the master was ever carried away; while his admirable quartet for stringed instruments is a proof, not only of his versatility, but also of his fine sense of the intimate in the world of chamber music. It is a curious fact that both Verdi and Rossini concluded their lengthy dramatic careers by writing sacred music.

I regret that I did not know Verdi personally. I once called upon him in Paris, but without meeting him, and received in return his visiting card at my hotel. I have kept it, and the envelope, on which he had written my—unfortunately not his—name, as a relic. That is all. How willingly would I have looked upon the man Verdi,

other two-thirds, he has inspired as much admiration as does devoted to rest, that is to say for musicians which he succeeded in

The Labour Days in its before his death, in its way, speaks as issued. — at least do any of his musical works.

In conclusion, I must from my readers to be lenient with this modest *causerie*, which only spur of the moment alone has fallen from my pen.

EDVARD GRIEG.

COPENHAGEN: February 1901.

THE BRITISH WORKMAN AND HIS COMPETITORS

THERE are distinct signs in the building trade that the wonderful prosperity of the last few years is waning. It is equally true that the German and American manufacturers are gradually, but surely, relieving England of very considerable portions of her trade. The cry of technical education is in the air; the London County Council have it in their minds to provide secondary education, and the sudden idea that new dwellings for the working classes are the antidote by which the British workman will successfully compete with his foreign friends has been propagated with marked success; but the real reason why the British workman will most assuredly be left behind has, somehow or other, been entirely overlooked.

I am fully satisfied that the British public has no real grasp whatever of the causes which are leading up to loss of trade in this country, and it is as much in the interest of the workman himself as of the public that no mistake should exist on this point.

As an architect I have for many years taken more than a passing interest in the men at work on the building, and it is to these men, and these only, that I propose to confine my remarks, giving credit, as I do, for the many who would only too willingly do their duty to their employers and to themselves, if they were permitted.

I find from the new working rule, which were agreed upon last year between the representatives of the London Master Builders' Association, and, respectively, the Operative Bricklayers', the Operative Stonemasons', and the Carpenters' and Joiners' Societies that the working hours in summer of the above-mentioned trades are fifty per week for forty weeks; that during twelve weeks of winter the working hours are for the first three weeks and the last three weeks forty-seven hours per week, and during the six middle weeks forty-four hours per week. The rate of wages is to be advanced one halfpenny per hour from certain dates in 1900 and 1901. Imagining for a moment that the men worked on Saturdays the same number of hours as on other days, this would give, as the average length of working hours for the six days in the week, say eight hours per day, or, in other words, about one-third of the six days and nights of a working week devoted to labour, the

other two-thirds, a traveller has no addition, the whole of Sunday, being devoted to rest, such as that is to be secured.

The Labour Deans in its life. of the Board of Trade have recently in the report on changes from the rates of wages and hours of labour in the United Kingdom, based on statistics from which the following are extracts:—

The net result of the changes in the wages of all classes of workpeople in 1899 was an aggregate rise of wages of no less than 125,000,000 per week, compared with 95,000,000 in 1898 and 45,000,000 in 1897. It will thus be seen that the rate of increase in 1898 was maintained in 1899. Great, however, as was the rise of wages in 1899 it has been considerably exceeded in the eight months of 1900 which have already elapsed (October 1900). The change recorded during this period may have affected nearly a million individuals, and have resulted in a net increase of more than 150,000,000 a week, by far the greatest rise recorded in any similar period.

Let us consider the effect upon the workmen of this increase of 150,000,000 a week, an increase in the opinion due to the efforts of Labour Members of Parliament, the Labour Members of the London County Council, and to Trade Unionism. It might be reasonably assumed that the decrease in the hours of labour, and the increase in wages, must result in improvement to the minds of the workmen, the laying up of a little store for future old age, and in extra comforts for the wives and children. We know that the men are paid at noon on Saturday, and then many of them are not seen again on the building till the Tuesday morning following. It may be that they have been studying the handiwork of their predecessors in the South Kensington Museum, or that they have been giving the benefit of their practical knowledge to some of the pupils at the technical schools, or have been doing a little work in the garden. That I do not know; but I do know that at the dinner hour on the Tuesday some of the men who have taken 3l. or so on the Saturday cannot get their dinner till they have borrowed the price of it from the foreman, so that the increase of wage has resulted in loss of work to the master, itself of the utmost importance, and has conferred no benefit whatever upon the workman or upon his family.

We will now take notice of the workmen upon the building, as I have found them. At 6.30 A.M. in summer, and 7 o'clock in winter, they commence work. They will first look around to detect whether or not there is a man who hath not on a 'ticket' to prove that he is a 'Unionist.' If one is found who is not a Unionist, the foreman is requested to immediately dismiss him on pain of the whole of the men in that trade instantly quitting. The result may be imagined; the master has to succumb. Having successfully performed this little operation, and 8 o'clock having arrived, the men retire for their breakfast till 8.30. At 10.30 beer is served round to the men (for which beer they pay, but not for the time in getting to and

drinking it), and this refreshment ends at noon for an hour's dinner-time in summer. About 3 P.M. beer is again served round them till 5 o'clock in summer and 4 o'clock in winter, at which time they quit the job. On Saturdays they leave off work at 12 o'clock noon, winter and summer.

A few peculiarities, which are permanent—may now be referred to. A bricklayer in some kind of work can well lay 1,200 bricks a day, but in the ordinary run of work he can easily lay, on the average, 750. Rules, however, step in which absolutely fix him not to exceed 500. If a bricklayer catches a plasterer fixing a wall tile nine inches by three inches he is again at the foreman to stop it, not, however, if the tile is six inches by six inches. Bricklayers have recently made up their minds that roof-tiling is their work, and not that of the regular tiler who thoroughly knows his work; so unless this work, which they do not understand, is given over to the bricklayers, and the tilers dismissed, the bricklayers strike the job. If the eagle eye of the plasterer observes a man fixing a fireproof plaster material—that is to say, a man sent off by the manufacturer of the material, and who is not a Unionist—off that man has to go, notwithstanding the important fact that he thoroughly understands that particular work and that the ordinary plasterer does not. The resulting defective work has to be immediately made good at the cost of the master or building owner. This same plasterer has also prevented, by his society, any superfluity of 'apprentices.' The present race of plasterers mean to have plenty of work in their time; let the future of the trade take care of itself. The mason too, also on the look-out, sees a bricklayer fixing a piece of stone to take the end of a girder; that is soon stopped; and the mason leaves his legitimate work to come and set this piece of stone, whilst the bricklayer looks on and perhaps smokes his cigarette—and so on. The other day a clerk of works, of work being carried out under my superintendence, informed me that all the bricklayers had struck because he refused to allow a bricklayer who was drunk at the dinner hour to go on the building. Fortunately we were able to fill their places with men from the country, but had to put up with the loss of time and inconvenience.

We will assume now that all is peaceful and quiet on the building; that the foreman has been subdued, and made to understand that he must not try to overwork his men. In times gone by if a foreman was seen approaching a group of idlers they would at once scatter and resume work; now they do nothing of the kind; they will stand idle and grin at the foreman or at any one else, as much as to say, 'Now look at us; we are being paid for working; we are not working, and what have you got to say?' I have to say that, taking the men on the average, they do not give a return of more than four hours' real honest work per day for the eight hours for

other two-thirds, a traveller has not many clearly defined impressions devoted to rest, sleep: that is to say, without regard to the national

The Labour Problem in its life. Of all his general impressions, the most prominent, at least in the beginning, is caused by the enormous increase in the price of materials from a territorial point of view, Russia per hour, but solely because they are considered because lying off the well-understood, law that the physical vastness of the United States is the doctrine of idleness, and to do the greatest possible amount of time in producing the smallest possible amount of work. Trade Unionism, the London County Council, the Electric Lighting Companies, and the District Councils are mainly responsible for this state of things, because of the want, or fear, of adequate supervision, and of the quiet toleration of organised idleness.

From those who do not really know, one hears that our men will be much improved, directly, by the result of the vast expenditure now incurred by the State in Technical Education. Last year about £15,000,000 was expended by the Technical Education Board of the London County Council, and to my mind, so far as the building artisan is concerned, this money was absolutely and entirely wasted. The majority of the men will be as blundering as ever; their handiwork is bad enough, but their eyes are about as well educated for the just appreciation of line and curve, for horizontal and vertical, as those of a cat. There never has been, and there never will be, any good substitute for the old-fashioned apprenticeship. Mr. J. D. Crace's letter on this subject, which appeared in the *Times* of the 2nd ult., should be read, and well digested, by every friend of the British workman; it is written by a man who knows, and I endorse every word of it.

I have referred to the current topic of dwellings for the working classes, and I say that one of the real reasons why they cannot be built to allow of low rents is the idleness of the workmen themselves. Fifteen years ago the price inserted in builders' tenders for the labour on a rod of brickwork was about 4s.; to-day it is 8s.; and even at that a builder is never sure that it may not be exceeded; and, dealing with the other trades, in the same proportion, I shall not be far wrong in stating that a block of workmen's dwellings which could well be erected for 100,000s. will now cost 132,000s., solely by reason of organised idleness, and interferences with the contractor in carrying on his work in a perfectly legitimate manner.

Then as to trade leaving the country, and why. Germans and Americans have seen, clearly enough, that if the cost of manufactured articles is so great in England—not by reason of enhanced price of materials, but only because of restriction in output of labour—they, unhampered by Trade Unionism, by the levelling down instead of by the levelling up, can produce and send over here articles quite as good in half the time to make, and with a third off the price which obtains in England, the result being that

Effect is, I
ch it in t

for what we can accordingly.

...ak there is one,
ong admin...

strong administrative

...winter, which will effectually
leave me willing to give a fair return
in appealing to the sense of
workman. I have no desire to

manliness of the British Unionism; but one cannot shut one's eyes to the abolition of Trade Union rates and judges have not dealt with the fact that our magistrates with words and deeds which have picketing, with threats, and abuse honest workman, with that whole-frightened and intimidated after deserved. They have rather fallen some chastisement which was as it stands controlled them; and back on the excuse that the six sh. while working, and any man to so I say, give them an Act of settling is a law, so unless they all ask for whatever wage he likes for his services, and we will permit him to work as many, and as few, hours as he likes, we unquestionably prevent his interference, in the slightest degree, directly or indirectly, with the man who, not caring to belong to a trade union, is desirous to do what is right—to earn 15s. or 16s. extra per week in overtime for the benefit of his wife and children and for provision for old age. The breach of the new law should result not in puny fines, which are immediately paid by the societies, but in terms of imprisonment, with hard labour, sufficient to act as a deterrent in the future.

Then, I sincerely believe, the British workman would be found more than a match for his foreign competitor; then he would work on Mondays as well as on other days; then would cease organised idleness; then the master might, as he should, rule instead of being ruled; then would the old form of apprenticeship reappear and 'technical education' cease; then could workmen's dwellings and other buildings be erected at a moderate price, enabling them to be let at low rents and still show a profit; then would the intelligent and quick workman be able to earn twice as much as the ignorant, idle blockhead who now can smile at the Saturday pay-place and walk off with as much money in his pocket as is in that of his vigorous neighbour. I, with most Englishmen, have the utmost sympathy with the men in their many trials and hardships. I know that, at bottom, they are as good as any in the world; but their conduct during the last ten years has tended to alienate all sympathy with and regard for them. If this communication, written with absolute confidence that serious danger to the British workman is imminent, should lead to summary and real alteration in his methods, then I am equally sure that the danger will be averted, and that builder, workman, and client will very soon reap the advantage.

WM. WOODWARD.

STRATA IN THE ROMAN FORUM

I

A WELL-CONSIDERED method is of the highest importance in all archaeological exploration. In the case of the Forum it is even more than ordinarily necessary, on account of the complex character of the excavations. The monuments are very diverse, and the traditions in regard to the more ancient of them are often confused. In addition, the many archaeological strata representing twenty centuries of eventful life demand investigation—strata which often interpenetrate one another, and are complicated by the natural irregularities of the ground.

Some of my first excavations were comparatively simple. The discoveries of the *favissæ* of the *ædes Vestæ*, the altar of *Cæsar*, and the *Niger Lapis* aroused general interest, but involved no great difficulty. I was, however, already beginning a different series of explorations, one intended to reach the limits of archaeological and geological stratification from the *Velia* to the *Tabularium*. A six years' previous study of the Forum had convinced me that the strenuous life of the people who made themselves masters of the ancient world had gradually changed the original form of the little valley, the cradle and arena of their political existence; and, on the other hand, that the explanation of several of their constructions there would have to be sought in the nature of the place itself.

Many of the most valuable relics of classical Rome were scattered broadcast in the Forum, some of them face downwards in the earth, or built up, regardless of their importance, into rubble walls; but the excavations have already gone far enough to prove that such ruined buildings as remain are only the last chapter of this long and precious volume of human history. Its earlier pages are still sealed to us, buried under travertine slabs or muddy deposit, or beneath mediæval paving-stones, relaid in the sixteenth century, and here and there perhaps even more recently. The historic value of all of these is as that of the sanitary whitewash which, in certain churches, records the visitations of the plague and hides the frescoes of Giotto.

Enlightened archaeology recognises that a single fact outweighs

drinking it), and this refreshment ended at noon for an hour's dinner-time in summer. About 3 P.M. beer is again served round them till 5 o'clock in summer and 4 o'clock in winter. On Saturdays they quit the job. used.

refuse the aid of working hypotheses in keeping present may afterwards be suggested by classical fires similar to those being leave off materials to those elsewhere of very careful consideration: those who accept it blindly are often nearer to the truth than those who hastily reject it. It is like an avalanche lying at the foot of a mountain. Careful search may show whether it started in a little ball of snow gathering more on its fall, or the breaking off of a bit of rock at the summit; it would be useless to argue that it must have originated where it lies.

In 1886 there was considerable discussion in Venice as to the traditions contained in early chronicles about the foundations of the Campanile of San Marco: 'precipuum opus in his vero palatibus admirandum,' as the Maggior Consiglio called it in 1405. Sagornini was quoted as having been of opinion in the fifteenth century that they ran down beneath the Piazza to a depth equal to the height of the Tower above. Another chronicler believed them to radiate in all directions, and a third that they were so widespread as to reach to the Basilica itself. As discussion failed nothing, I dug beside the Campanile, down to the level of the platform resting upon piles. The foundations were nearly vertical, neither radiating nor greatly extended, and scarcely five metres deep. In this investigation I took count not only of the methods of construction made use of in the foundations, but also of the character of the ground supporting and surrounding them. Thus I was able to note the artificial density of the soil brought about by means of the piles, and also to see that the level of the Piazza had been raised. Under the present pavement was another, a mediæval floor of opus spicatum, which is now no higher than the daily high water mark. This anomaly was explicable by comparison with the conditions known in other parts of the Lagoon, where the clay beneath the islands is gaining in density and shrinking, sometimes several hundred feet below ground.

II

The exploration of archæological as well as of geological strata can often be made, as in this instance, while examining the foundations of a building, or, in the same way, of such parts of ruins as remain buried. The examination is made by digging small perpendicular shafts close to the walls. When, in making these, we come upon other structures, we must continue horizontally till we reach their edge, and then again descend till we arrive at virgin soil.

These sections show that the traveller has not many clearly defined impressions of the number and kind: that is to say, without regard to the national knowledge which grows in its life. Of all his general impressions, the one which is at least in the beginning, is caused by the much more extended varieties from a territorial point of view, Russia.

Where the immediate is only considered because lying off the is well to begin, if practicable, the physical vastness of the United trench, first cleaning its sides until the strata are plainly visible there. The different and more absorbent nature of the soil with which such a hollow has been filled up often reveals its existence. It was thus that in January 1899 I began to study the Lapis Niger. I wished first to examine the layer of travertine chips, on which rested both the kerb which surrounds it and the Imperial pavement of the Comitium. While carefully scraping the layer of chips, I came upon a medieval well, lined with fragments of marble, in which, among other things, was a piece of a cancellum of the ninth century. I drained and cleared out the well, and when I dug below it I traversed many geological strata before I reached the blue 'Vatican' clay at a depth of twenty-three metres.

This well was my opportunity for it had evidently been sunk during the middle ages through all the archaeological strata which lie beneath the imperial pavement. When I removed the lining of the sides each stratum stood revealed—the flooring of tufa massiciata, and the earlier floorings of gravel and beaten earth. Towards the Lapis Niger, the lower of these strata were seen to have been buried under a layer of gravel upon which were the extensive remains of a very great sacrifice—ashes, charcoal, &c. The whole had afterwards been sealed down with an artificial mass, made up of broken tufa and travertine, and of chips of black marble, the same as that of which the Lapis Niger is composed. Above this mass were layers of rough earth used to raise the level of the Comitium in the days of the Empire and in the middle ages.

When all these strata had thus been identified it only remained to examine them in their several beds. The recollection of the tradition of one or two lions standing close to the supposed tomb of Romulus led me to proceed to do this towards the Lapis Niger. Excavating horizontally, I came upon the more easterly of the pedestals, with their characteristic Etruscan moulding, upon which the lions may have stood. In exploring beyond this, I was forced to have recourse to vertical sections under the Lapis Niger, which was, meanwhile, shored up with temporary props. This was a long process, but one amply repaid by the great importance of the monuments brought to light—the cippus with its inscription, the cone, and the other pedestal—and the many and various votive offerings, mixed with sacrificial remains, placed around them, after their desecration and destruction had been wrought, possibly, as I

ways to London. Accustomed to hear the capital of France held up as essentially the first city of the world, he is surprised to find, on visiting it, that, in comparison with the English capital, the throngs of people in its streets appear much less great; its wealth, as far as revealed to the public eye, smaller; its shops less varied, though more showy in display; its pavements less clean. The sense of ~~personal security~~ on the principal streets of London is absolute; in Paris, on the other hand, this sense is not at all firm, even on the crowded boulevards, and justly so in the light of the number of instances of lawlessness that startle the foreigner, and of which he is only too often the victim.

In all the great cities of Europe, the American observes at every turn mechanical appliances that cause him at first to smile, and then, as he suffers inconvenience or discomfort from them, to grow impatient. For instance, he finds that the modern electrical system has only partially been substituted for the omnibus. The omnibus is rendered still more primitive in Paris by the peculiar system of tickets in use there. What would be the emotions of the people of the United States if their chief reliance for getting about in their towns were omnibus lines, which required the passenger to obtain a numbered ticket from an office before he could secure a seat, with the probability of having to wait for a second omnibus because the first arriving was filled up before his number could be called? No American has much belief in the progressive spirit of a country where such a system as this is tolerated for a day.

Nor is he much more patient with the London omnibus, although no ticket is required in advance, and he is allowed to get aboard if there is a vacant seat. It is a very pleasant means of locomotion in summer, when one can ride on top, and is not pressed for time. But suppose, as is too often the case, the vehicle is crowded with passengers outside, and your reason for haste is so imperative that you are compelled to be satisfied with a seat inside; you are forced to ride in a box, with all the windows clamped down and every breath of fresh air kept out. Nor is it much better in winter, with the air made foul by the exhalations of a dozen or more human beings, packed together like chickens in a coop.

With the vast population, which is steadily growing to more colossal proportions, some means of surface transportation, faster, more convenient and more comfortable than even the most improved omnibus, is certain in time to be adopted. Enterprising American men of business who visit London clearly perceive the possibilities of gain that lie in such an enormous volume of passenger traffic, and will solve the problem of rapid transit, even if the English should not. The modern surface electric car cannot meet all the conditions to be dealt with, on account of the narrowness of those streets which are now most congested. It is inevitable that the day shall arrive when

either the ground under London will be a network of tunnels for electric railways, or the tops of the houses on one side of each great thoroughfare will be cut down to a uniform level, and above this a viaduct, resting upon pillars at short intervals, built.

A system like that of the New York elevated is not likely to come into general use in London, as it would shut off the light to an intolerable degree, owing to the narrowness of the streets. If the elevated railway is practicable at all, it is practicable only as running over the tops of the houses; this already has a counterpart in the viaducts by which all the great railways enter London, and also in the viaducts in Continental towns, which, like the long viaduct at Innsbruck, to mention only one, form the sides of streets in the cities through which they pass. The intervals between the pillars are there used for ordinary dwelling-houses, shops, or warehouses, and the whole resembles a ~~series~~ of apartments in one long, narrow mass of masonry.

As curious a proof as the omnibus of the conservative ways of the English people is the manner in which coals for the household fires are distributed and stored. Instead of the American coal-cart, which is loaded in less than five minutes from an elevated coal bin, the American visiting London finds an ordinary waggon made to carry about a dozen large bags of coal, which are filled one by one at an expense of much time and labour, and then lifted into the vehicle like so many milk-cans. When an American coal-cart reaches the house where its load is to be dumped, the cart is backed up against the side of the pavement, the chute is drawn out like the barrel of a telescope, and the end inserted in the coal-hole; in a few minutes the entire load, with the rush of water falling over a small cataract, runs down into a heap on the floor of the coal-cellar. In London, on the other hand, each bag of coal has to be taken separately from the waggon, and emptied as near as may be in the coal-hole; and when the task is at last finished, the coal which has fallen on the pavement has to be laboriously shovelled into the coal-cellar.

There are, in only too many branches of trade in London, equally strong proofs of an almost slavish adherence to conservative methods which the spirit of American progress condemns. There seems to be a general impression in England that nothing can be done quickly and yet thoroughly, and that it is as repugnant to real growth to make innovations in the commercial life of the country as in the political. With their extraordinary prosperity in recent years it is only natural that Englishmen, apart from their unconscious hatred of change, should think that their entire manner of doing business, down to the smallest details, is the best that could be adopted; but while they have been resting in this contented frame of mind, two nations have boldly entered those fields in which the English have so long been pre-eminent, and have shown an ability not only to rival,

but even to some extent to surpass, English manufacturers and merchants in securing trade. Germany and the United States are the two competitors whom Great Britain has the most reason to fear even in her own islands, unless she can rid herself of all those antiquated methods and appliances which are doing much to impede her progress.

It has been long the habit in Europe to wonder at and ridicule the Americans for allowing themselves practically no rest whatever from the cares and harassments of business; and so far as this rule of conduct involves the mere health of the individual, the condemnation of the Europeans is fully deserved. The average American in every branch of business wears out his physical powers before his time; and only too often, under the self-imposed strain, his mental powers break down also; but the high pressure at which he works in the maturity of his strength, intellectual and physical, however bad for himself in the end, is very good for the community in which he lives. Thousands and tens and hundreds of thousands fall in their tracks, like soldiers in the fire and smoke of battle, victims of their own over-stimulated energies; but their places are promptly taken by younger men, animated by the same indefatigable and unfaltering spirit. The community is practically made up of men working at a white heat, and its progress is hastened by the very fact that this heat is so consuming that before it dies out in the average individual it injures if it does not destroy him.

What has been the result of this entire absorption of the American in business life, without regard to anything that can be justly called recreation? The United States to-day, though not yet a century and a half old, is rapidly moving to the first place in the very van of the world's commercial Powers. Her aggregate wealth is the largest of all the nations, though she is the youngest. Only one country is leaping forward in trade with the same inexhaustible and untiring energy as herself. This is Germany. With all his faults, the ruler of that great Empire is thoroughly in sympathy with the American commercial spirit, which is so lavish and even reckless of its own strength; restless, energetic, determined, farseeing, knowing clearly what he wants in spite of changing moods, he is justly winning the reputation of being the greatest of German Sovereigns in the later economic history of the Fatherland.

The commercial development of Germany, now in such rapid progress, is the most interesting side of the economic life of Europe in the present era. How enormous this development already is, is indirectly disclosed in the falling off in the volume of emigration in spite of the burden of the German military system. The room for employment has, so far, outgrown the expansion of the population, great as that has been; but the very impetus which increased opportunities for earning a subsistence will give to the growth of the

population will, in time, swell the number of inhabitants to such a figure that the tide of emigration will set outward again to an extent equal to anything observed in the past. The Emperor foresees this; he knows that when one of his subjects settles in the United States he is entirely lost to his native country; but if there were colonies to which this outflowing population could be directed, emigration, so far from weakening the Empire, would strengthen it, for not only would it enlarge the territorial domain of Germany, but also create new markets for German manufactures.

Where are the new colonies to be planted? In Africa? It is not likely that the climate will ever permit of a great development of the German African possessions. In Asia? Even should the Chinese Empire be partitioned, and Germany secure a share, there will be no room on that already overcrowded soil for any one but German commercial agents. South America, and South America alone, offers any field for German expansion. The German Emperor very probably sees this clearly; but he knows that German colonisation on that continent inevitably means a conflict of arms with the United States, all the citizens of which, irrespective of party, are determined to support the Monroe doctrine to the last ditch, as the only bulwark against European aggression in the western hemisphere. This is, perhaps, the chief reason why he made such an urgent appeal for a larger navy; and we suspect that it is also a partial explanation of his recent friendly attitude towards Great Britain. It would be only natural that, if he has any design upon South America, he should wish to break up any possible understanding between the British and American Governments, amounting practically to an alliance. No European nation will ever venture to go to war with the United States, if it feels sure that the latter can rely upon the assistance of an English fleet. Whatever the blandishments of the Emperor William, it is not probable that England will ever stand idly by and allow the Republic to be overwhelmed in the defence of the Monroe doctrine, for Great Britain is as much interested as the United States in its maintenance.

The impression prevails among the great body of the American people that the material growth of the European countries, in the course of the last fifty years, has been small in comparison with that of the United States. In a certain sense this impression is correct. There is nothing whatever in the modern history of Europe that is suggestive, in the slightest degree, of that wave of population which, almost in a single lifetime, has spread from the Western spurs of the Alleghenies to the slopes of the Pacific; nor does Europe furnish a counterpart of the growth of Cincinnati, St. Paul and Denver, and, greatest of all, San Francisco and Chicago, cities which have sprung up with the quickness of the prophet's gourd. The increase in the populations of London, Berlin, and

Vienna is, however, quite as good proof of a phenomenal material advance as the increase in the populations of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia; indeed, from some points of view, it is even more significant, for London, Berlin, and Vienna, unlike the American cities on the Atlantic coast, have had no virgin country of inexhaustible natural resources, in the course of rapid development, to quicken their expansion in wealth and population.

The European traveller who visited the older States of the Union in 1860 would not, on a second visit in 1900, be more struck with their enormous advance in wealth and population than an American traveller in Europe in 1900 would be with the advance of the leading European countries in the same direction, as compared with their condition as he had observed it forty years earlier. This growth would be chiefly due to the enlargement of every branch of manufactures, and to the extension of every department of foreign commerce. It would be reflected not only in the expansion of the towns, but also in the increase in the number of railways, and in the reclamation of waste lands, whether of marsh or forest, for the purposes of a highly improved system of agriculture.

Europe owes, in a purely economic way, comparatively little to the United States, while the United States owes incalculable benefits to Europe. The material growth of the European nations, as a whole, has never derived an extraordinary stimulus from the material growth of the United States except to the extent of a larger demand for European goods; the growth of the United States, on the other hand, has been vastly promoted, not only by the addition to its native population of millions of European emigrants, but also by the investment in American enterprises, especially in new railways, of hundreds of millions of European capital.

III

The American is deeply impressed with the unbroken continuity of the past and present in all the countries of Europe, including France, outside of Paris. Where does the Present begin? Where does the Past end? Such are the questions he asks himself as he visits each of these countries in turn, strolls through their temples and palaces, examines their sculpture, painting and architecture, studies the physical types of the people as they pass along the streets and highways, and observes their customs and national character. As he pauses in his walks, upon some commanding spot like Westminster Bridge in London, or Ponte di Carraja in Florence, and gazes upon the surrounding scenes, at once so ancient and so modern, he feels as if he were looking down a vista of time in which the remotest past is as close at hand as the present itself, owing to something phenomenal in the medium through which the vision penetrates.

In his own country, the American has no such sense of historical continuity; the past is vaguely associated in his mind with the general idea of material growth—with progress from very small to very great things of an economical nature alone. The spirit of the colonial age, the only part of his country's annals which has the true historical glamour, from the European point of view, is so repugnant to the spirit of the Republican era that he finds it difficult to believe that the colonial period really forms a part of American history. It seems rather a part of English history alone.

There have been but two really great periods in the annals of the Republic proper—the war of the Revolution and the war of Secession. Had the theatre of these two mighty series of events been confined to an area as narrow as England, and that area had made up the entire territory of the United States, they would have done much to form that kind of vivid perspective which impresses the American so deeply, and which is largely due to the concentration of events within more or less contracted boundaries. The battlefields of the Revolution, however, are scattered over an extent of territory almost as wide as Europe itself, and in consequence they create no historical atmosphere common to the whole country; on the other hand, the greater number of the principal battlefields of the war between the States are situated in Virginia, but this is but one State, and necessarily widely separated from all the States not contiguous to its own borders.

In Virginia and Massachusetts alone there is to be found anything that even remotely resembles that historical perspective which the American is so conscious of in Europe. In Virginia, however, the continuity of the Past and Present is greatly broken. First, there was the colonial age when the people loyally supported King and Church; the Revolution came and the colonial institutions were torn up root and branch. Then followed the period of slavery and the large plantation under the Republican *régime*; slavery was swept away in the war of Secession, and the large plantation system perished under the stress of the economic changes which resulted. In less than one hundred and thirty years the whole framework of the economic and political affairs of Virginia and the older States of the South has been not merely shattered, but completely destroyed; France alone of the European nations can furnish a parallel to this, and France, unlike the Southern States, has reverted at least twice to its original form of government.

The national life of the United States has so far had but two world-conspicuous sides—the political and the economic; it is only in the course of the last thirty years that it has begun to present, though still in a modified degree, other phases of almost equal interest to mankind at large. The finest works of art are still imported. That the American should still remain unequal to the European in the highest branches of painting and sculpture, or at

least unequal to his brother Anglo-Saxon in England, is the less explicable now that the American student, even of small means, has, from the comparative inexpensiveness of the Transatlantic voyage, all the galleries of the Old World in which to study; and is, in respect of opportunities for perfecting himself in the technical details of his art, practically on the same footing as his English, French, German, or Italian contemporaries.

In spite of the increasing number of American painters and sculptors of genius, the time seems still remote when the European millionaire will import works of art from the United States in the number that the American millionaire now imports similar works from Europe; nor are we likely to hear soon of European artists emigrating to the United States in order to enjoy the superior artistic atmosphere of Boston, New York, or Washington. The fact that American painting and sculpture have not been carried to the perfection of modern European is certainly not due to a lack of patronage, for no American millionaire considers his house complete in detail if a gallery is wanting. That is a part of his state; and he is always ready to pay tens of thousands and even hundreds of thousands of dollars for any picture or statue, foreign or domestic, which the world agrees in rating as the product of extraordinary genius. No local supply of transcendent merit has really sprung up to meet the demand of these wealthy patrons, who would buy at home as quickly as they would abroad, if there were at home the same opportunity of making the most valuable purchases.

There is not much reason, at least at present, for thinking that the United States will ever be the seat of a great school of painting or sculpture thoroughly distinctive of the soil. This would mean an extraordinary devotion to the pursuit of beauty alone in a community in which the attainment of the useful is the almost exclusive aim of every aspiration, an aim that produces an atmosphere that chills the artistic spirit, in spite of the patronage which the owners of large fortunes are ready to extend. But in those lines which combine beauty with utility, the United States is quite equal to the countries of the Old World; thus in architecture the American is beginning to show as much genius as the modern European, although hampered by the fact that the background in all American cities is so new; or where that background is comparatively old, as in some parts of Boston and Philadelphia, it is trivial and uninteresting.

The growing tendency in the United States is, in private residences, to go back to the colonial style of architecture, an excellent proof of the steady cultivation of the national taste; on the other hand, the Capitol at Washington—massive, severe and plain, in imitation of its Greek prototype—is now recognised as the true model of all great American public buildings. How inappropriate such a structure as the English Parliament House would have appeared in its place! How

far more suitable the colonial style of the White House for the Chief Magistrate of the United States than some specimen of Gothic architecture which might have been chosen! The picturesque background is lacking in America, and the less ornate the architecture, the more consonant with the genius of the people and their physical environment.

The only contemporary literature of Europe with which it would be just to compare American is that of England, and in the domain of fiction, at least, there is no reason to think that the United States occupies a very inferior position. American novelists are concentrating their best powers more and more upon the description of unique local influences, and the delineation of what may be termed the primitive differences in American character, still so conspicuous in so many parts of the United States; so that American fiction, taken as a whole, already furnishes an almost complete picture of every side of American life, provincial as well as metropolitan. There was a time, and it is not very remote even yet, when English novelists set the tune and the pace, as it were, for every school of fiction in the United States. That time has passed; there is nothing in the best contemporary fiction of America to suggest imitation of English models. The Southern States, in the course of the last twenty-five years, have been especially productive in imaginative writers, whose works have all the racy flavour of a provincial soil, the nearest after all to nature, and, therefore, the most distinctly pronounced in its characteristics. Page in Virginia, Cable in Louisiana, Murfree in Tennessee, and Harris in Georgia belong essentially to an original school because they have the insight of genius into certain sides of American life and character, that are all the more impressive because lying so entirely outside of every metropolitan or cosmopolitan influence. Thomas Hardy and Rudyard Kipling alone, of English writers now living, are superior to them in freshness of humour and pathos, and in a certain depth and vigour of sympathy that come from familiarity with nature in its simplest and most elemental forms.

Well may the English novelists envy the American that variety of material which the primitiveness of personal types in the United States presents to a degree almost without example in the Old World. What do we see in England to-day? The leading writers of fiction, in only too many instances, are compelled either by an impoverished field or by their faded imaginations, to turn to living men and women of prominence for characters of striking originality. If in some this would seem to prove great poverty of invention, in others, perhaps, it shows a keen commercial spirit, which uses this means to stimulate the sale of novels which otherwise would have only a partial success. Never before have so many works of fiction been issued in England, but never before, perhaps, has she been so poor

in novelists of the very first rank. The eyes of millions of English-speaking people on both sides of the water are strained to catch the first glimpse of an imaginative writer who shall equal those who made the middle of the Victorian era so illustrious; it would appear from present signs that he is just as likely to arise in the United States as in Great Britain.

An ideal type of journalism would be a cross between the English and the American newspaper, a hybrid in the best sense, that would possess the brightness, acuteness, and amplitude of the latter, the reserve, dignity, and reliability of the former. The journalism of the United States, as a whole, reflects not only the energy and shrewdness of the American people, but also their frivolity, lightness, and shallowness; on the other hand, English journalism reflects the slowness and heaviness of the English people, as well as their earnestness, truthfulness, and honesty. The American wishes to be amused rather than to be instructed by his daily newspaper; the Englishman wishes simply to be instructed.

It is characteristic of the two peoples that what may be described as the great Reviews of the United States—reviews devoted to a thorough and elaborate discussion of contemporary questions, after the English manner—can be counted on three fingers of one hand, while in England reviews of that kind are, perhaps, the most numerous and the most popular, in the best sense, of all the forms of periodical literature. Even the highly educated American prefers the magazine, bright, superficial, and beautifully illustrated, because no tax is imposed on his mental powers in grasping its contents; what he wants is something that he can read with great intellectual ease, as he passes in the street-car from his home to his office in the morning, and from his office to his home in the afternoon.

The American newspaper is, from one point of view at least, much more open than the English; there is no influence whatever that will induce the average American journalist to suppress what he considers to be news, however embarrassing the disclosure may be to the Government, mortifying to individuals, or discreditable to the general reputation of the community. The result of his ferreting out every fact of interest, and perfect candour and unshrinking boldness in publishing it, is that foreigners obtain the impression from reading American journals that American life, in all of its branches, social, political, commercial and financial, is the most corrupt in existence; but this is because all that is bad is dragged into light. If the press of Europe to-day were as candid, bold, and thorough as the American press, there would be spread abroad as deep an impression of corruption in some branches of European life—in the social and financial certainly, perhaps in the commercial, though not in the political—as now prevails about American life.

How long would the American press have refrained from exposing

the inefficiency and incompetency which the English themselves admit they have in too many cases shown in the Boer War, had that war been one in which the United States was engaged? Unlike the contest with the Boers, the Spanish-American contest was a triumph from beginning to end, and yet this did not deter a pitiless exposure at the moment of every error of judgment and of every instance of corruption that marked its progress. If the Boer War had been an American enterprise, not a single transaction would have been left in the dark; there would have been no veil to tear away from its events when the conflict was over, because no veil would have been permitted to exist from the beginning; nor would any man have been too high in rank, though Secretary at War or Commander-in-Chief, to be held up to condemnation if in fault.

To the mind of the American journalist, what does not appear in the columns of the English newspapers is often of more interest than what is actually published; to him the news suppressed is really the most significant and valuable news after all. He will not admit for one instant that the supposed military necessity of hiding British errors and points of weakness from foreign Powers is any just reason for the concealment of the proper responsibility for both; and he would insist that the only true way to make a nation strong is to proclaim boldly and openly every deficiency until every deficiency is corrected; but in taking such an extreme position he would, perhaps, simply be showing his ignorance of what the European situation, so different from the American, really demands.

The only arm of military power with which the great body of the people of the United States is familiar is the Militia, and except in the great cities, and in crowded districts in the coal and iron regions, where strikes are constantly occurring, and where, therefore, every form of military force is necessarily greatly respected, the citizen-soldiery is regarded with considerable amusement, not un-mixed with contempt, in the popular mind. The Americans of this generation are too unaccustomed to real war at their own doors to look with great seriousness on the raw Militia, summoned from counter and factory to parade the streets, or manœuvre in a baseball field, when some annual holiday rolls around again. The sections of the regular army are so widely scattered over the vast area of the United States that there are millions of people there who have never seen a soldier in the Federal uniform.

How different in Europe, especially on the Continent! The smallest town has a barrack; the most familiar music is the strains of the military band. So common is the presence of soldiery that they soon cease to be noticed even by the American. However opposed to militarism, he is compelled to admit that it serves two excellent purposes, apart from creating a bulwark against foreign invasion. First, the ubiquitous soldiery enforces everywhere in

Europe (except in France, perhaps) a respect for order, property, and life, which is incomparably greater than what is seen in the United States; under the shadow of these forests of bayonets the sense of security is absolute—a very satisfactory condition to the mass of people whose aims are peaceful and harmless. Secondly, it overshadows plutocracy, which has already done so much in the United States to repress and dwarf the individual citizen, because there the power of money is in the end the controlling power.

On the Continent, military armament is the necessity of the situation rather than a natural outgrowth of national character; Germany in the western hemisphere, or seated on the British Islands, would be just as free in its institutions as England or the United States; England and the United States, placed on the European Continent, would be just as military in spirit and policy as Germany. France masquerades as a Republic, but a successful war to-morrow would throw it into the arms of a dictator and a new dynasty. The safety of the Continental Powers lies not only in their armies, but also in the quickness with which they can strike, and no nation can strike so quickly as the one which has the reins of government in a single hand. While the democracy of England or the United States were laboriously preparing for a war, Germany would have concluded it. Her thunderbolt is always ready, and at the first tap of the tocsin it falls.

PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE.

MONARCHY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

THE death of Queen Victoria has naturally suggested some consideration of the part which Royalty has played in the politics of the world during the last sixty years. At the time of the late Queen's accession, the institution was a good deal discredited on the Continent of Europe, and even in England. The great reaction, which followed the revolutionary wave at the close of the previous century, had spent itself, and a distinctly Republican feeling was noticeable in most Western countries. Royalty had done little to vindicate its *métier* after the fall of Napoleon. The Bourbon Restoration in France had been a conspicuous failure, and had ended, ignominiously enough, in the Revolution of 1830. The *bourgeois* monarchy of Louis Philippe, which followed, had failed to make the royal office popular at home or respected abroad. The King himself, though a man in many ways of great intellectual ability and considerable knowledge both of the world and of books, was a self-opinionated pedant, who believed that human nature could be deceived to an unlimited extent by forms and words. The system under which he ruled France was a despotism of the middle classes, which had not even the merit of being honest. The eighteen years of Louis Philippe's reign had the effect of finally alienating the French people from monarchical institutions. Under this shabbily corrupt *régime*, feeling was steadily ripening for the outburst of 1848, which led the way in France to another trial of Cæsarism, and finally to what seems likely to be permanent Republicanism.

In the other States of the Continent, the thrones were not as a rule in good odour, and were making no effort to adjust their footing to the rising flood of Democracy. In Austria, the old Emperor Francis the First, who had lived right through the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, a veritable legacy from the eighteenth century, had been succeeded, in 1835, by the well-intentioned and thoroughly incapable Ferdinand, who surrendered himself blindly to the spiritual despotism of the Ultramontane clergy and to the stubborn policy of sitting on the safety-valve in temporal matters which Metternich industriously

cultivated. The Prussian monarchy, after temporarily putting itself at the head of the national German movement in the War of Liberation, had relapsed ingloriously under King Frederick William the Third, and subsided into a course of narrow repression which was gradually arousing even its equable and long-suffering subjects to angry revolt. Nor can it be said that the brilliant rhetorician, Frederick William the Fourth, who succeeded to the Brandenburg Throne not long after the accession of Queen Victoria, did much to mend matters. His want of capacity and resolution threw back the movement in favour of German unity for a good many years, and enabled Austria to continue playing the dominant part in the Germanic world long after she had forfeited all reasonable claims to that position. In Russia, the Tsar Nicolas, much occupied in opposing the aspirations of the Poles and other nationalities within his dominions, showed neither capacity nor desire to improve the internal condition of his vast heterogeneous realm, or to carry on the work of civilising the Muscovite Empire which had been undertaken by the great Sovereigns of the previous century. Between them, the three absolutist Courts of Europe were still pledged to the dangerous doctrines of the Holy Alliance, and engaged in an absurdly futile attempt to stem the tide of human progress, and to arrest the spread of progressive institutions. It is perhaps worth noticing that nearly all the members of this group of rulers were in a condition of imperfect mental or physical health. Ferdinand of Austria was a weakly invalid; Frederick William the Fourth of Prussia became paralysed and insane at a comparatively early age; Nicolas, though gifted with the gigantic physical proportions of the Romanoffs, was not altogether of sound mind; and Louis Philippe was vain, egotistical, and injudicious to the last degree, and towards the close of his reign his intelligence showed obvious signs of suffering from the trials and labours to which he had been subjected in the days of his misfortunes half a century earlier.

In England itself, the monarchy was less popular than it had been at any time since the latter part of the seventeenth century. George the Fourth had thoroughly disgraced the office, and had deeply affronted all that was best in the sentiment of the English people. Although his offences were condoned, especially by the fashionable world of the metropolis, they were never really forgiven by the middle classes or by the masses, with whom, ever since Queen Caroline's trial, the King had been openly and bitterly disliked. How prevalent this feeling was, and how little attempt was made to disguise it, is shown by the outspoken comment of the *Times* when George the Fourth died. Without even making a pretence of conventional eulogium, the leading journal wrote of the

dead King with a frankness which in these days strikes us as almost brutal :

The truth is—and it speaks volumes about the man—that there never was an individual less regretted by his fellow-creatures than this deceased King. What eye has wept for him ? What heart has heaved one throb of unmercenary sorrow ? Was there at any time a gorgeous pageant on the stage more completely forgotten than he has been, even from the day on which the heralds proclaimed his successor ? Has not that successor gained more upon the English tastes and prepossessions of his subjects, by the blunt and unaffected—even should it be the grotesque—cordiality of his demeanour, within a few short weeks, than George the Fourth—that Leviathan of the *haut ton*—ever did during the sixty-eight years of his existence ? If George the Fourth ever had a friend—a devoted friend—in any rank of life, we protest that the name of him or her has not yet reached us.

There is nothing in this passage which is not thoroughly justified by all that is known and recorded of the career of His Sacred Majesty the Fourth George ; but we need only measure the distance we have traversed, since that period, by endeavouring to conceive of a respectable London newspaper publishing a criticism of this kind on the very morrow of the death of a Royal personage, no matter what his character had been. William the Fourth, though a considerable improvement on his brother, was not in himself a particularly estimable person. He was good-natured, well-meaning, self-indulgent, and rather stupid. The best that could be said of him was that he had done little harm, and in a muddle-headed fashion had meant well by the country. The *Times* was a little more polite to him than his predecessor, but it was openly contemptuous :

All is now over. The good old King of England is relieved from earthly trouble—from mental anxiety, domestic and political—from bodily suffering, such as it was terrible to witness. Death has done its worst on what was mortal of King William, and the memory of his inoffensive nature will protect that portion of him which bade defiance to death from the shafts of human envy, vengeance, or malignity. The monarch whose loss we now deplore had committed no wrong, had provoked no enemy, and in the tomb need fear no slander. . . .

This was not exactly the kind of sovereign to raise the reputation of the Crown in the eyes of a people who were disposed to decry it, or to withstand the growth of Radical and Republican feeling. In point of fact, when the Queen came to the Throne, a large part of England was flagrantly anti-monarchical. Of the two great political parties, one, indeed, was ostentatiously opposed to the Court and what it considered the Court faction. But outside the Whigs and the Tories there was an immense body of unenfranchised, but not inarticulate, opinion in the country, which was strongly inclined to Republicanism, and by it the ancient constitutional Monarchy of Great Britain was treated with flagrant disrespect. The populace of London, which in recent years has become frantic in its demonstrations of attachment to the Throne and its occupant, was in those days, notoriously disloyal. Greville in his Diary, describing the marriage

of the Queen, notes it as rather an agreeable sign that the behaviour of the people showed some amount of courtesy and interest.¹

To intelligent observers in 1837 or thereabouts, several of the great States of the world seemed on the verge of imminent disruption or revolt. De Tocqueville says in his *Memoirs* that during this period any person, at all accustomed to follow political phenomena with attention, might have been quite sure that France was preparing for revolution. Germany, Italy, and Austria were seething with discontent, and working themselves into the feverish condition which culminated in the events of 1848 and 1849. Not only were there economic distress and political dissatisfaction, but in most of the Continental countries there seemed to be a loosening of the national ties, and a dissolution into their component elements of the more or less artificial State-systems created in the preceding century. And to a certain extent the same tendencies were perceptible even in the British Empire. England was in a highly restless and unsatisfied temper of mind when the young Queen assumed the crown. The labouring masses were impatient of their lot, which had by no means improved during the preceding decades; the middle classes, though prosperous enough, were irritated by the undue share of political power and social distinction which still remained with the privileged orders; and the general impression seems to have been that the body politic was in a somewhat unhealthy condition, and that violent remedies might become necessary. Greville notes that during the closing days of King William the Fourth everybody went about with a profound conviction that something serious was going to happen, though, it is true, he adds, with his usual philosophical cynicism, 'Nothing will happen, because in this country nothing ever *does* happen.' Possibly if he could have foreseen the terrific calamity which, within the course of the next few years, was to visit Ireland and almost shatter the whole fabric of society in that unfortunate country, even the complacent diarist might have altered his opinion. Outside the United Kingdom there was little loyalty and a very languid sense of devotion to the Mother-Country. Canada was fermenting with rebellion and half its population were in favour of hauling down the British flag and setting up as a Republic on their own account. In the other colonies, Great Britain was regarded as a harsh and disagreeable stepmother, who would be disowned at the earliest convenient opportunity; while in England itself a highly influential school of political thought, to which some of the most able politicians of the day belonged, notoriously regarded the Imperial tie as one quite certain to be severed at an early date,

¹ 'The Queen proceeded in state from Buckingham House to St. James's without any cheering, but then it was raining enough to damp warmer loyalty than that of a London mob. . . . Upon leaving the palace for Windsor she and her young husband were pretty well received.'—*Greville Memoirs*, vol. iv. chap. vii.

and maintained that the main duty of the central Government towards the Colonies was to prepare them for that independence which they were bound to claim before long. In fact, an observant visitor from the planet Mars, if he had dropped upon Europe in the early forties, might have been justified in supposing that Great Britain, in common with France, Spain, Austria, Prussia, and most of the other Continental countries, was approaching political dissolution.

The change which has occurred in the intervening period is prodigious. Europe has its troubles in abundance, and there is no civilised country which has not plenty of anxieties both in regard to international and domestic affairs; but there is scarcely a great, or even a small, nation of the European family which has not been for a good many years past fairly compact, well-knit, and politically solid. The age, which is covered by the reign of Queen Victoria, has been the era of nation-building, of national reconstruction. The loose and shaky fabrics, which seemed tottering to their fall sixty years ago, have now in most cases become sound, water-tight, and stable structures. Several of the nations have realised their sense of unity, and nearly all of them are well and firmly governed under monarchical institutions. It would be too much to say that the constitutional or economic position of all is perfectly satisfactory; but it is at any rate true that the organisation is complete and in good working order, and that the disruptive tendencies have either disappeared or have remained in abeyance. Many causes have combined to bring about these results; but it is undeniable that one of the most efficient factors has been the character and personality of the sovereigns who have occupied several of the European thrones during a greater or less portion of the period. That which, in our ignorance of the laws that govern human destinies, we call Chance, decreed that the line of feeble or incapable monarchs, who occupied the thrones of Europe during the earlier part of the nineteenth century, should be succeeded by a number of kings and queens who possessed conspicuous force of character, considerable mental and physical energy, and an unusual faculty for government. After George the Fourth and William the Fourth and Louis Philippe and Francis and Ferdinand and the two Frederick Williams and the unhappy individuals who finally discredited the thrones of the Spanish Bourbons, we have had Queen Victoria of England, William the First and then William the Second of Prussia, Francis Joseph of Austria, Victor Emmanuel of Italy, Alexander the Second the 'Tsar Liberator' of Russia, Leopold the First of Belgium, King Christian of Denmark, and Queen Christina of Spain. Not all these rulers have been men or women of genius, perhaps not one of them was; but it is, I think, safe to assert that they have been gifted with some of the best and most useful qualities which a sovereign can have. They have nearly

all been strong sovereigns, they have laboured for the interests of their respective countries with assiduity and zeal, and their personal character in most cases was such as to attach to them the loyalty and regard of the masses of their subjects. It happened also, by another happy stroke of Fate, that several of them lived to an advanced age, and that their reigns were prolonged far beyond the average span of rule allotted to sovereigns. There is, perhaps, no other station in life in which length of years is so palpable an advantage as in that of kingship. Loyalty is always a plant of slow growth; and it was exceedingly fortunate that the second revolutionary phase in modern Europe was followed by a period in which, in several countries, the Kings and Queens reigned long enough to gain a firm hold upon the affections of their subjects. No one can doubt that in the case of Queen Victoria the secular duration of her reign has been of the utmost political value to the British Empire. It took years before the people, either of Great Britain or of Greater Britain, were really weaned from the contemptuous toleration which they had extended to the last preceding scions of the Hanoverian dynasty. During the first portion of their married life the Queen and the Prince Consort were scarcely popular, and it was not perhaps until after Prince Albert's death that Her Majesty began to occupy her extraordinary and unique position in the affections of the English race. And it is equally indisputable that the personality of the Queen has been a real consolidating agency in the British Empire. While Downing Street was lecturing the Colonies, and while the Colonists were still raw with the old sense of suspicion and distrust, there was a growing pride in the Throne and an increasing sentimental attachment to the reigning family. In a constitutional monarchy, as Walter Bagehot has said, one of the chief functions of Royal personages is to perform the ordinary transactions of life in an interesting manner. This assuredly was what Queen Victoria and her descendants have been doing industriously for more than half a century, and it would be impossible to exaggerate the effect of their exalted domesticity on peoples like those of the various Anglo-Saxon communities. The sense of a profound interest, and a kind of proprietorship, in the Courts at Osborne, Windsor, and Balmoral, quickened by occasional visits of princes to India and the Colonies, was really welding the British Empire together, even while Imperial Federation was still not more than the hobby of a few public men and the occasional commonplace of a political banquet. Nothing is more curious than the absolute disappearance, not only of the Separatist, but also of the Republican, sentiment in the British Empire. In spite of Ireland and South Africa, it is true to say that there are a quite insignificant number of persons to-day, who would seriously contemplate any political changes which would remove them altogether from the control of the King of England.

The 'Bond of Empire' has not been the so-called 'Imperial' Parliament, which the Legislatures of the self-governing Colonies have always regarded with jealousy, nor the Imperial Cabinet, which is only one of the many committees that administer the several portions of the British Empire, but the Throne, as represented by a venerated Sovereign. There has been a most remarkable modification of the feeling with regard to the Royal prerogative. Colonial constitutionalists like the Canadian Alpheus Todd, the author of the standard work on 'Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies,' are now inclined even to exaggerate the powers of the Crown. This, of course, is done with the direct object of proving that the Colonial Legislatures are co-equal with that of the United Kingdom and not in any way subordinate to it. But we may well doubt whether there would be this contented acquiescence in the Royal supremacy, if the wearer of the crown, during the past half-century, had been a George the Third or a George the Fourth. Unconsciously the Canadian and Australian writers have generalised from the particular case before them, and have assumed that the Head of the Imperial Realm must be such a one as Queen Victoria was, so virtuous in private life, so careful of her subjects' rights and liberties in the conduct of public affairs.

On the Continent of Europe the influence of a few able and strong-minded sovereigns has been even more striking and beneficial than in Great Britain. England, though restless and uncomfortable in the early forties, was far too sound politically to be in real danger of revolution, whatever contemporary pessimists might imagine. It was otherwise in the Latin, the Teutonic, and the Slav countries. Sixty years ago several of the nations of Europe had to be kept from falling to pieces. And in almost every case the work would never have been accomplished but for the personal energy, the force of character, and the executive ability, of the monarch. When he did not possess such qualities, the enterprise was not carried out. If the great King or the good Queen did not appear, the country passed from one period of civil disorder and dissension to another. Who knows what might have happened in France itself, if Napoleon the Third had been able to shake himself free from intriguers and corrupt favourites, and had given the country a Court of which it could be legitimately proud? Or take the case of Spain. While Italy and Germany were being consolidated, while Austria was recovering from the dynamic shocks of 1848 and 1849, Spain went through a series of dramatic convulsions, tried Republicanism in several forms, was experimented upon by various ambitious soldiers and some idealists of the Castelar type, and got back again to its old dynasty after a period of unsatisfactory dalliance with another one. Only since the death of Alphonso the Twelfth has the Peninsula begun to regain political security, if indeed it has yet won it. During the

years when the other Powers were undergoing the regenerating process, Spain was apparently falling to pieces. Why? It would be rash to give the reason in a sentence. But there is the undoubted fact that Spain, until recently, has been singularly unlucky in its sovereigns. During the first third of the century the Spanish Bourbons were represented by Ferdinand the Seventh, one of the most incapable members of an incapable race. Perfidious, narrow-minded, violent, and weak, Ferdinand did more mischief to Spain than Bonaparte with all his legions had ever been able to effect. He restored the Inquisition, he placed the country afresh under the heel of the clericals, and he lost the better portion of the magnificent over-sea Empire of Spain. When this unhappy despot died in 1833 the sceptre, if Spain had been fortunate, should have passed into the hands of a wise, strong, and judicious ruler. But though the hour had come, the man, on this occasion, had not. Instead there were only two women, or rather one woman and a child. The disgraceful regency of Maria Christina was succeeded by the still more disgraceful reign of Ferdinand's daughter, Isabella the Second. So the disease of the body politic grew and ripened into the fevers and perturbations referred to, and has only been soothed of late years by the firm and honourable government of that excellent Austrian princess, the Queen-Regent. Had the widow of Ferdinand the Seventh ruled Spain in 1833 as Don Alphonso's widow has ruled since 1885, several *pronunciamientos* and many troubles of other kinds might have been spared that much-vexed country. But Spain, half a century ago, seemed in no worse plight than Austria. It is difficult to exaggerate the gravity of the condition in which that amiable weakling, Kaiser Ferdinand the First—'le débonnaire' as he was called—had left the Empire of the Hapsburgs. Good-natured and feeble, he had abandoned the administration to a *Conferenz* or Camarilla, consisting of his uncle, his brother, and the two reactionaries, Metternich and Kolowrat. Between them, and with the active assistance of the priests and the Empress, they had made matters utterly desperate. Half the young Emperor's dominions were in revolt. The Hungarians proclaimed their independence, and vindicated it by overthrowing the Imperial armies in battle after battle. There seemed no future for the monarchy, with its jumble of races, religions, and languages, except annihilation or partition, or at the best an ignominious dependence upon Russia. Yet the boy-Emperor contrived to postpone the inevitable for half a century and more. Francis Joseph has not been a very estimable personage in private life, nor has he the personal charm of many other sovereigns. But as a master of statecraft he has few equals. Silent, reserved, egotistical, with few friends and no confidants, he has shown himself a very Odysseus, *πολύμητις*, many-wiled, much-enduring, among the monarchs of the world. Somehow he has kept the loose bundle of sticks together; and if it is beyond his power, and beyond

the power of any man, to solve the insoluble problem of making a nation of such a 'geographical expression' as Austria, he has at any rate gone nearer to success in this labour of Sisyphus than seemed possible when the Magyar columns were on the march for Vienna. When he dies, the cataclysm, as many men expect, must come. But if so, all the more astonishing are the tact, the statesmanship, the mingled firmness and judgment, which have postponed the inevitable for over half a century. It is the personal influence of Francis Joseph, and practically nothing else, that unites the Dual Monarchy. Hungary would long since have cut the loose tie which links her to the Cisleithanian State, but for the attachment of the Magyars to their 'King'—the King, be it remembered, who represents the Hapsburg dynasty against which they broke into fierce revolt in 1848. As for the Germans, and the Slavs, the Czechs, Ruthenians, and Poles, their racial antipathies are as violent as ever, with the result that they have almost wrecked the Parliamentary system, for which their fathers were ready to lay down their lives. Constitutional government is a notorious failure in Austria, and is worked under a perpetual succession of ministerial crises and legislative deadlocks, varied by occasional free fights on the floor of the Reichsrath. If the people endure it all with relative tranquillity, it is because the Throne is regarded as the permanent moderating element, which will somehow keep the ship of state on an even keel. No one is greatly concerned when a Premier, after a brief and wrangling Session, follows his cohort of short-lived predecessors into retirement or opposition. The Emperor-King, it is felt, is the real Prime Minister, and he can be relied upon to see that the government is carried on, and that the noisy politicians of Vienna and Pesth do not too seriously endanger the common weal. Here, assuredly, it is the King who governs as well as reigns; and under the forms of constitutionalism Kaiser Franz Joseph exercises a more genuine control over public affairs than the majority of his autocratic ancestors. The lumbering and cranky machine jolts along, kept from toppling over by that steady hand upon the levers. Who among the fiery Republicans, and the idealist Liberals, of the Kossuth era, could have predicted that in the twentieth century Austria should still owe her salvation, not to her parliaments or her laws, but to one shrewd old man in the palace of her ancient princes?

Of Italy and of Germany something has been said already. I suppose no one will deny that the revival of both countries has been due, in great part, to their soldiers and their statesmen. Yet who can doubt that all the efforts of the heroes, the martyrs, and the sages had been in vain, but that at the critical conjuncture the national movement passed into the keeping of true patriot Sovereigns, bold and strong? Italy was made a nation, not by Garibaldi or Cavour, but by Victor Emmanuel. It was his courage, his military

talents, his rough but genuine sincerity, and his political capacity which brought about the great achievement. He succeeded to the Throne of Savoy in 1849 under circumstances as unfavourable as could be imagined. The Austrians, badly beaten in Hungary, had been only too successful south of the Alps. After the victory at Novara, Marshal Radetzky forced Charles Albert to abdicate, and pressed his young successor to accept peace by abolishing the Constitution granted by his father. How the new King held out, with his simple formula, 'I must keep my oath to my people;' how he did eventually obtain peace upon comparatively easy terms; how he reorganised the finances and the administration, by calling to his counsels such men as La Marmora and Cavour; how he waited, gradually accumulating his resources, till the time came, in association with France, to strike another blow at Austria; how with the aid of Garibaldi he joined the Two Sicilies to the growing kingdom; how by seizing his opportunities in '66 and '70 he drove the *Tedeschi* out of Venice, and at length planted the flag of United Italy in the Eternal City itself: these things are written in the most stirring pages of nineteenth-century history. It is impossible to read them and to deny that the *Re Galantuomo* is the real hero of the epic, the centre and inspiring figure of the whole drama. Without him Sardinia would not have become Italy, and Italy would not have become a nation. The same may be said of the first German Emperor. We may give as much credit as we please to the military talents of Moltke and the massive genius of Bismarck. Yet it is to the King that we must ascribe no small share of the praise due to their achievements, if only because he rendered them possible. Neither the strategist nor the statesman could have obtained his opportunities, if the Throne of Prussia, at the critical period, had been occupied by another vacillating rhetorician like Frederick William the Fourth.

The smaller nations have been as much indebted to their Sovereigns as their larger rivals. Belgium was fortunate in starting life as a kingdom under a monarch so admirable as the first King Leopold, the expert in constitutionalism who was the mentor of Queen Victoria. The little country was just a handful of provinces, snatched with difficulty from the greedy hands of the Dutch, menaced by French ambition, and disturbed by clerical squabbles. Leopold not only conserved its independence, but created a Flemish nation, and launched it safely on its way under a model Parliamentary system. Here, again, it is safe to say that nothing but the personal influence and great European reputation of the King could have seen the little country safely through the many troubles of its infancy and adolescence. Denmark is another striking case. For eight-and-thirty years that kingdom has been ruled with singular success and ability by Christian the Ninth. The old King—he was born a year

before Queen Victoria—has had to pilot Denmark through some stormy seas. In the first year of his reign he had to reconcile the Danes to the failure of their heroic struggle against Austria and Prussia, and to abandon nearly half the national territory to his colossal opponents. The Danes, an enterprising and thrifty people, consoled themselves for their descent into the ranks of the very minor Powers by growing prosperous and rich. But, politically, 'something is rotten in the state of Denmark,' and has been for years past. The Constitution has not been quite a success, the Radicals have shown themselves violent and unreasonable, the Conservatives reactionary and intolerant, and Parliamentary government has resolved itself into an apparently interminable dispute between the two Chambers of the Legislature. It sounds dangerous, and perhaps would be so—but there is always the King, who, as in Austria, is the reconciler and moderator, the true source and centre of political stability.

About the most remarkable case of all is that of Japan. In the reign of the present Emperor, the Island Kingdom has passed through the evolution of centuries. When he became Mikado in 1867, Japan was only just emerging from the depth of her mediæval feudalism. He is only a middle-aged man to-day, and in the intervening space the Empire has caught up with Europe, has adopted all the latest ideas of the West, and is in the very van of modern progress, so that she can almost give lessons in military organisation to Germany, and in railway management to the United States. No such breathless national movement is known to history. Nor can there be any doubt that the marvellous process has been rendered possible by the firmness and judgment of the Emperor, and by the manner in which he has succeeded in gaining the confidence of his alert and vivacious subjects. Modern Japan—the Japan of the last three decades—has grown up round the throne of the Mikados, which its present occupant and his immediate predecessor rescued from impotent subordination to the usurping Shogunate. When the history of the newest of the Great Powers comes to be written, one can hardly doubt that Mutsuhito will be counted among the great statesmen-sovereigns of the modern world. But the regeneration of Japan is scarcely more striking than the revival of Mexico during the last twenty years. Peace, political security, internal order, financial solvency, material prosperity, a rapid industrial development, have taken the place of the civil dissensions, the corruption, the administrative muddle, which at one time seemed the normal condition of any Spanish-American State; and we can scarcely question that one, perhaps the most efficient element in producing the salutary change, has been the character of President Diaz, who was re-elected for his sixth term of office last year. Nominally a Republic, Mexico has practically become a personal monarchy, governed with a semi-despotic, but

most beneficent, authority, by a ruler who, for wisdom and capacity, has had few superiors, even among the patriot kings and queens of the nineteenth century.

Thus from the Far East to the Far West, the story is the same. The nations have owed much, some of them have owed everything, to their Sovereigns. Royalty, which was discredited and disliked at the beginning of the century, is almost everywhere regarded with confidence and esteem at its close. In some countries, like Austria, it is the bulwark against confusion and disruption. In others, the Throne is looked upon as a means of securing continuity in international policy, and as a valuable check upon the instability produced by the caprices of democracy and the violence of factions. It is perfectly true, as Mr. Balfour recently remarked, that monarchy in England is really stronger than it was half a century ago. He might have added with truth that Parliament is weaker. This is not due to royal encroachments, but because, while the Sovereigns in Great Britain and in other countries have performed their function admirably, the supreme legislative assemblies, elected by the popular vote, have accomplished theirs with constant friction and difficulty. In one Parliament there has prevailed chronic deadlock, in another indecent violence, in a third scandalous obstruction, in a fourth a division into squabbling groups incapable of doing business or controlling administration. The contrast between the frequent inadequacy of the Parliamentary machine and the smooth effectiveness of Royalty has not escaped the peoples; and the late Queen Victoria, if she had chosen, could have made use of her prerogative to an extent which would have provoked insurrection if attempted by her predecessors. If a dispute had arisen between the Queen and any of her later Cabinets or Parliaments, I do not think there can be any doubt as to the side which would have been taken by the majority of the nation. To such heights of genuine authority has Royalty ascended in the past thirty or forty years! Will it retain its singularly fortunate and commanding position in the twentieth century? That is a question on which it is impossible to hazard an answer. Everything, or nearly everything, depends on the accident—if accident it is—of personal character. If, instead of such Sovereigns as Victoria and William the First, of Francis Joseph and Alexander the Second, of Victor Emmanuel and Leopold of Belgium, we should have a series like George the Fourth and Queen Isabella, King 'Bomba,' or Ferdinand the Seventh, or even a few more Royal personages no better or stronger than Frederick William of Prussia, or William the Fourth of England, the rising influence of monarchy will assuredly ebb and wane again. The speculation is all the more interesting since in several countries the sceptre has passed, or will soon pass, into new and untried hands. The Tsar, the Queen of Holland, the King of Italy, are youthful

Sovereigns ; when the fifty-three years' reign of Kaiser Franz Joseph ends the young Archduke Franz Ferdinand will become Austrian Emperor ; Alphonso the Thirteenth of Spain is sixteen years of age, and will presently be King in fact as well as in name ; in the ordinary course of nature Count Albert of Bavaria (now aged twenty-two) must before long be King of the Belgians ; and the King of Denmark is eighty-two years old. The close of the nineteenth century, the death of Queen Victoria, mark the end of an epoch. New men and women will be left to deal with the problems of the new era.

SIDNEY LOW.

MARIA HOLROYD¹

WHEN Maria Holroyd parted from her distinguished friend, Mr. Gibbon—an old friend, much admired, sincerely loved, a little laughed at—she was probably not of opinion that here ended the most interesting period of a very long life. Were there not balls at Brighton and a certain dark young man on the horizon? The moment when she ended her work upon his Autobiography marked the final parting, rather than the hour of his death. We know when the little great man himself had put the last touch to that Colossus of his, which has so victoriously withstood a century of earthquakes and excavations, how he walked upon his terrace and with what feeling he surveyed those glorious silent companions of his laborious days, the vast range of mountains and the purple waters of Lake Lemman. When Maria had finished her own little work, as it were a statuette to be held on the hand of the Colossus, she might fitly have walked round the garden at Sheffield Place or the ornamental water in St. James's Park, and enjoyed in her measure the sense of achievement. It is more likely that she awoke to a vexed sense of something neglected, and hastened to Madame Friand's about that sadly delayed striped muslin gown or sat down to write twenty notes of invitation. For Maria was a woman, and, moreover, she was not primarily a woman of letters; rather she was one of first-rate abilities, who did well whatever she was given to do. The taste and skill with which she put together the received Autobiography of Gibbon are plain enough since a later generation has brought to light the six originals. The autobiography is not a branch of literature in which the Briton excels. I remember once reading a collection of autobiographies, all English, all as intimate, as lively, as informing, as a half-column obituary in the *Times*, except one: that was written by a Continental. He put down everything, not omitting to tell you what a bore his wife was and exactly how many francs she had cost him in illnesses, which was extremely bad taste; but his was the only one worth reading. Gibbon was a Briton still, in spite of his wise and early flight from his country. He has

¹ *The Early Married Life of Maria Josefa, Lady Stanley*, edited by J. H. Adeane.

his dignity; he wants the genial expansiveness, the naïf egotism of our continental, and therefore his Autobiography is not the model of its kind which several generations of his countrymen pronounced it. But as English autobiographies go it is a masterpiece, interesting, characteristic; above all, admirable in literary form and proportion; and herein lies its debt to Maria Holroyd. The injury done to the individuality of the work by her manipulation is suprisingly small. She has omitted scarcely any characteristic passage except Mr. Gibbon's remarks on Venice. A certain alderman of a certain English city not long since was heard to sigh, as he gazed commiseratingly on the Grand Canal from the deck of a steamer: 'Ah, if we could only get our B——m City Council to work on this, what a different place we should make of it!' Gibbon also wanted to make a different place of it. Maria, although she herself considered the uninteresting capital of Belgium the finest town she had ever seen, yet seems to have felt that the line must be drawn somewhere even in our taste for flat monotony; and she drew it at Venice. She suppressed Mr. Gibbon's opinion of the magic city, so eminently characteristic of the man, who had about him no humbug and no romance; the man who not only saw nothing to admire, but nothing to wonder at in the rise of Christianity and the vast fabric of the mediæval Church.

Gibbon was by no means the only interesting association of Maria's youth. Her father, Lord Sheffield, belonged to that pleasant, well-bred, cosmopolitan society which the French Revolution broke to pieces. In the earlier volume of her letters may be followed those experiences of hers—the opening scenes of the Revolution, the hopes and fears of Lally Tollendal and the Constitutionalists, the sufferings, the charms, the follies of the emigrant *aristos*. When the storm burst and Paris disappeared in a blood-red cloud, she had stood among the watchers on our shores who strained their eyes to catch a glimpse of friends left behind in the 'mad city,' or welcome the fugitives who from time to time struggled out of it and across the sea to a miserable safety. It was these five-and-twenty years under her father's roof which enabled her to retain the brightness of her mind through more than twice as many which she was to pass as a Cheshire squireess. Apart from her individual worth, she was of more importance than most young ladies as the heiress-presumptive of Lord Sheffield, who, however, persevered in the pursuit of matrimony till in his old age and by his third wife he achieved a son and heir. In spite of her prospects, which a hundred years earlier would have made her hand the subject of endless bargainings between Lord Sheffield and noblemen with eligible sons, there is no trace of any attempt to marry her to a selected husband. Evidently the business marriage arranged by parents and guardians, though it still figures in the plays and novels of her day, is out of fashion in

real life. The age of romance has begun. The romance of John Stanley and Maria Holroyd was not of a kind to satisfy Miss Lydia Languish, but fortunately it continued to please its hero and heroine to the end—which was the end of their married life. They met at Brighton, danced together at balls and fell in love, Maria perhaps a little more rapidly than the gentleman. The kind, wise stepmother and aunt desire nothing more than to marry a girl they value to the man of her heart who is excellent and eligible. Aunt Serena advises, 'the dear Lady' assists, but Maria seems to cause them anxiety. She is so impetuous, she has 'deliriums,' she has tempers, she can even when in spirits be downright noisy; and that, if not her worst, is plainly her most unattractive defect in the eyes of these good women of the world of a hundred years ago, when sensibility and consumption were considered so becoming to a young woman. But Maria for once is meek, and all goes well. Not only does 'the dear Lady' receive a proposal for her stepdaughter from Mr. Stanley—*mammas* have sometimes a way of producing proposals—but Maria has really won the affections of him whom she thenceforth calls simply 'the Man.' John Stanley certainly had no reason to repent his choice; for, though others may still have suffered from the asperities of her disposition, to him she was devoted with a loyal, ardent, and somewhat blind devotion very characteristic of women of her stamp.

John Stanley was the eldest son of an unremarkable Cheshire squire and a Welsh heiress not unremarkable. Her beautiful face, fading, alas! on the canvas of Sir Joshua, as once it faded in the flesh, still sparkles through dimness on the wall of her empty home, amid the blank visages of earlier Owens less favoured by Nature and Art. This house of Penrhôs, where she was born, was then no more than the manor of an Anglesey squire, a bare house in a bare field, wind-swept, hardly more than a stone's-throw from an iron coast, whither then, as now, winter brought its tale of wrecks. She and her successors have transformed and beautified it; but even then it must have been somewhat more important than the average house of the class, which in North Wales, judging from the few which remain, were seldom above the level of English farmhouses, however long the pedigree of the inhabitants. The Owens, however, had come to inherit several of these manors, and the fatherless little Margaret was an heiress from her cradle. Therefore, Madam Owen, her mother, took her to London, riding across Wales on a pillion, and married her to a big English squire, as it has been the custom to marry Welsh heiresses—a custom whereby genuine Welsh families were minished and brought low, and the little Principality provided with great landowners conscientious enough for the most part, but having a different language, a different temperament, and, worst of all, different prejudices from the rest of the population. In the case of Margaret Owen, the English marriage had results more

immediately and intimately bad. But the story of 'lovely Peggy of Anglesey' is not to be found in her son's *Præterita*. It may be that Miss Adeane will one day publish her letters from France, written in 1768; at once a commentary and a contrast to those of her future daughter-in-law, written three-and-twenty years later from the very stage of the Revolution—a contrast, although both women have lively pens, for Maria is a remarkably gifted girl, educated, thoughtful, socially not always a success; Lady Stanley, a thoughtless, beautiful woman, witty, fascinating, intoxicated with balls, *fêtes, trente-et-un*, and admiration. For this very reason she truthfully reflects the gay colours of that French world of *grands seigneurs* which she loved so well, asking no better than to join their airy dance on the crust of the volcano already hot beneath their callous little heels. She seems early to have lost her taste for the world, but not for the Continent, and it was her doing that, instead of being educated at Westminster School, her son John began at fifteen a desultory education of travel. Among the places he visited with his tutor was Brunswick, where he met in their first youth the ill-fated family of the reigning Duke, who had married a sister of George the Third. Young Stanley arrived at the moment of the eldest daughter Augusta's marriage to the Prince of Würtemberg. She was not yet sixteen, 'very fair, with light hair, and had an interesting figure.' Her husband, although heir to the throne of Würtemberg, took service in Russia under Catherine the Second. They had lived there a few years, and she had borne him three children, when he left the country, taking his children with him and abandoning his young wife, with whom he was discontented, to the tender mercies, called the immediate protection, of the Empress. What she had done to offend that great and terrible woman is rather guessed than known. But Augusta of Würtemberg disappeared silently from the world of the Court, and there appeared in the grim castle of Lode, on the shores of the Baltic, a princess and her retinue. The princess was young, fair, charming; she entertained the neighbouring nobility with infinite grace, danced, even waltzed with them, and took by storm, if she did not break, the 'country hearts' of Count and Baron. But gradually the retinue diminished, the gay parties came to an end; at length the blonde princess disappeared as silently from the castle of Lode as she had disappeared from St. Petersburg. Her father and husband were briefly informed that she was 'no more.' Her father, who had abandoned her to the vengeance of Catherine as callously as her husband, now asked for her body and particulars of her death. He received no answer; and some said she was still living, an exile in Siberia. On the shores of the Baltic she was long remembered, and probably her fate was not unknown. But a whole generation passed before a member of her family visited the castle of Lode and found in the cellar a body so

far preserved by the atmosphere as to be recognisably hers. So died and lay unburied the eldest daughter of Brunswick. The two elder sons of the House died not tragically but young. The third and last was 'Brunswick's fated chieftain' who fell at Waterloo, having never inherited more than an empty title. The younger daughter, Caroline, made a deep impression on John Stanley's very youthful heart. She was a 'lively pretty girl' of fourteen, 'with light and powdered hair hanging in curls on her neck, lips from which only sweet words seemed as if they could flow, with looks animated, and always simply and modestly dressed. How well I remember her in a pale blue gown with scarcely a trick of ornament!' Some years later Mirabeau described her as '*tout à fait aimable, spirituelle, jolie, vive, séillante.*' Long afterwards Stanley met her again as Princess of Wales, a woman both foolish and unfortunate, dining at Blackheath with the exiled and neglected old Duchess of Brunswick. He could find in her scarcely a trace of the pretty charming Caroline of his youth: so ill an effect has misfortune on the character and appearance.

Switzerland was already a country to which young gentlemen were sent for their education. It had not the modern apparatus, but they enjoyed there some advantages no longer to be had in that most dreadfully *bourgeois* of countries. There was society good in every sense of the word, and foreigners who came well recommended were admitted to it. In earlier years Margaret Lady Stanley, leaving behind her the dear, dissipated, brilliant world of the French nobility, had journeyed to Lausanne and pronounced the Swiss in general slow and their ladies in particular frumps. This was not how they struck young Mr. Gibbon or her own son, who at eighteen found Elysium at Neufchatel. In truth, Swiss society appears to have been simpler, better educated, freer, and purer than that of Paris or Lyons, the metropolis of the South, although no doubt poorer in elegance, in wit, and in pre-eminent personalities. The Swiss nobility, afterwards all but extinguished by the Revolution, would seem to have been less exclusive than the French, as we find names with and without the *particule* mingled in social gatherings. But its existence implied a standard of manners now quite outside the imagination of the opulent Swiss hotel-keeper or of the dully comfortable citizen of the little town which the screaming expresses shoot past to deposit their load at the regular tourist dépôts. Moreover, there existed in this unreformed old Switzerland, as there does not in the model democracy of to-day, an intellectual life of native growth, not mere grafts here from Paris, there from Berlin. Gibbon's favourable view of the Swiss Government of his time is borne out by an observation of John Stanley's. Writing of Piedmont, where he afterwards spent a year, he says: 'In my own country I had heard of public rights being attended to

and preserved as if they were as inherent to the soil as the grass which grew on it; in Switzerland they were everything . . .

His account of Italy, of the Sardinian Court, immediately before the cataclysm of the Great War, is interesting; especially when one reflects that this kingdom of the Two Sardinias, this royal House of Savoy, to all appearance so hopelessly decadent and corrupt, was to be in the following century the rallying-point, the mainspring of a great national movement. Stanley's account of Turin and Piedmont is enlivened by a letter from his mother, whose 'wit and pleasantry,' says Mrs. Thrale, never deserted her, even in her somewhat dreary old age. She with a more than modern freedom relegated 'Sir John and the damsels,' her daughters, to Bath, while she took a year on the Continent, ostensibly in the interest of her son's education. 'Be assured,' writes mamma, 'his youthful days are much more wisely spent than those of most English lads are: he sees good company and hears talk of reason, principle, and morals, which few others do. One may hope therefore that he will turn out better than the generality.' *Audi alteram partem*—namely, the son.

I had a violin master and Italian master and a drawing master. My Italian master was an abbé. I read little with him, but I made him teach me chess. Of my music master I remember little, but that he was always talking to me about shooting and sporting dogs. My drawing master, instead of teaching me much, made a miniature of me. . . . Of my dancing master I can say no more than that on Ash Wednesday he came to me from Mass with his forehead covered with ashes, which he had taken care to plaster on from fear of their falling off.

Yet, considering what English public schools were then and long afterwards, mamma was not altogether wrong. This peripatetic school gave young Stanley the superior culture, the refined manners, perhaps the high principle and independence of mind, which recommended him to the Holroyds and other persons of judgment. But for literature, while he had much love, he had little taste. Miss Adeane might with advantage have given us Blake's illustration of Bürger's Lenore unaccompanied by Stanley's verses and 'happy ending,' which sits as oddly on that weird Gothic fancy as would keepsake ringlets on a devil of Notre Dame. Her well-chosen passages from his *Præterita* contain many things of interest, but on the whole his pen toils limply along beside the other crisp and lively quills she has laid under contribution. In 1789 he organised an expedition to the almost unknown shores of Iceland. 'Twas an enterprise to be applauded; yet, for reading about, better is an expedition to Weymouth in the company of the Miss Holroyds. In the present volume the two Miss Holroyds of Sheffield Place are no longer to be found there, but Aunt Serena continues to sparkle in the society of Bath. 'We meet once more in her correspondence with that valiant woman Hannah More, worthy to be remembered not as the author of *Cælebs* or *Sacred Dramas*, but as one of the first in the honourable

succession of men and women who for more than a hundred years have been struggling with the social problem of the industrial age :

The parish is very wild and poor, kept only by the working in the Mendip mines, and for that reason particularly sought out by these benevolent women. The ignorance of the miners was beyond all conception ; they really knew not the name of God. Hannah More tamed them first by good offices, and then by taking their children and getting matrons to teach them to work and to be good. The parents came to listen and were gradually civilised. The first seven years was sad labour and would have made anyone else despair. The men who were such savages are now perfectly honest and good. There is a company of volunteers entirely composed of these *ci-devant* savage miners, but the officers and all the neighbours say they know no regiment that can boast of better-disciplined soldiers or of more industrious men. They exercised before us yesterday. Hannah ordered every man a little loaf of plum bread and as much strong beer as they could properly drink with it. They drank the King's health with cheers and rural joy. They drank their Colonel's health with singing, and played 'God save the King.' They have a little band of music, and everyone joined in the chorus.

Thus Hannah More, a prey to what the modern critic would call militarism, endeavoured to make good citizens as well as Christians of her miners. There is a special interest to us in such chance records of the spirit of English men and women a hundred years since. This generation also is girding its loins to meet a crisis in the nation's fate, and we are fain to know just how our fathers fronted the storm and what manner of vessel was this England which they brought us so safely and so gloriously into harbour. And with whatever voice the future may answer us when we question, the past gives us an answer of good hope. Fiercer gales, more tremendous seas, are yet to beat upon the good ship, but her timbers are not merely as sound as of old, they are sounder than they were when she weathered the tempest which ushered in the departed century. There was an anti-English party in England then as now, and if none of them were found privately advising Bonaparte how best he might give Mr. Pitt a fall, it was probably because our rude forefathers passed a discouraging measure called the Traitorous Correspondence Bill. In the main we see that the Englishman of that day confronted a national peril in the same way that he has confronted and will confront it to-day ; and that even then some good Britons were ridiculous. The balance of the absurd is no doubt upon our side, that of serious anxieties within on the other. In Maria's letter from Newcastle, where Stanley was serving as an officer in the Militia, there are statements which, allowing for exaggeration, yet show a state of feeling worse than any which could be said to exist in the England of to-day :

I cannot sit down quietly to write to you without from time to time looking round to see if the French are behind me, for really the alarm here is so great, and I am afraid so just, that I hear of nothing else. The apathy displayed in this part of the kingdom cannot be exceeded, though it may be equalled, by all orders and degrees of persons in all places and in all situations. Not a step is taken towards

raising the supplementary Militia. . . . It is very doubtful whether the keelmen and pitmen will assist the French or us in case of a landing; yet none of the pit-owners or gentlemen of the county have spirit enough to assemble them and represent that to defend the country is to defend themselves, as the object of the enemy will be to destroy the collieries, which must deprive them of bread. To gain them would be to gain the assistance of 9,000 able men. One would think the whole nation had taken a soporific draught, or were desirous, rather than fearful, of the success of our enemies.

. . . What is said in London of India affairs? They will supply excellent food for the croakers, with much apparent reason too. The West Indies too; what dreadful accounts of mortality from there! These are not humdrum times, it must be acknowledged, but replete with most important and serious events affecting every individual, however exalted or however obscure, in every part of Europe.

Several vessels are near the shore; amongst others a 50-gun ship to protect the colliers. She has brought in a French frigate which had long infested the coast. I am sorry to say out of thirty men which composed the crew of the French vessel twenty-five were English or Irish. I think it will be a pity if they are not severely punished.

It was not, I imagine, admiration for the rights of man or for General Bonaparte which brought those English sailors aboard the French privateer. It was the Press-gang and the other tyrannies and iniquities practised on British seamen which had driven them to desertion and piracy. For this was written in the year 1797, which saw that strange, methodical, loyal, constitutional mutiny at the Nore, whereby the men on whom the country depended for its safety testified to the intolerable treatment meted out to them. Maria implies that the Newcastle pitmen nursed Revolutionary sentiments, which they may very justly have done; nevertheless they would probably have given the *Légion Noire* an even more alarming reception than did those red-cloaked Welsh women who repelled them from the coast of Pembrokeshire.

The Militia seem to have been out continuously during the year 1797, and John Stanley did his duty by them manfully. The men themselves responded to his efforts, but here is the history of an attempt to reform the War Office of the day:

My Man has laid hold of a famous abuse in the regiment, which he has undertaken to correct, merely because he does not like to put his name to an untruth to cheat Government. (Poor man! to be an old Roman in the days of the Emperors!) . . . He has discerned that, 'whoso signeth or doth sign a return of effective men, as effective men able to carry arms, if they are not so, shall be cashiered, according to the exact terms of the Articles of War.'

Eleven boys from the age of seven to fourteen are returned and mustered as effective men, and receive pay as such, though they are not even drummers or fifers. Yesterday was the day for signing a weekly return, and accordingly he insisted on the eleven young gentlemen being removed from the list before his name should make its respectable appearance at the bottom of the paper. And he wrote to Lord Grey upon the subject, who, I expect, will be wonderfully astounded and (perhaps internally only) shockingly indignant, for he was instrumental in part of the business. . . . Lord Grey has spoken to the Duke of York respecting the drummer-boys, with the Man's reasons for not returning them

on the effective strength of the regiment, namely: that they were not capable of bearing arms. I give you Lord Grey's words: 'The Duke of York perfectly approves of the regulations I had adopted relating to the boys, as he conceives it was not possible to keep up the establishment of drummers and fifers in a regiment unless some boys were taken and instructed in order to replace vacancies that might happen. He said, though this was not strictly conformable to the King's regulations, that it was customary, and adopted by most regiments in the service, and was always allowed as far as one company. I therefore desire all the boys may be replaced and returned as privates, as formerly, which the Duke of York has directed me to inform you of.'

Stanley still declined to return the boys as effectives, and, the Muster Master eventually coming over to his side, they temporarily defied the War Office. But what shall be said of the noble lords there? Whatever the offences of their modern successors, they are scarcely so hardened in iniquity as His Highness of York and Lord Grey.

The following year Stanley left the Militia and settled down at Alderley, where he soon grew to be, in Maria's language, 'rooted like the beech-trees.' This would scarcely seem a life well suited to one of Maria's keen intelligence and eager temperament, but devotion to 'the Man' appears to have kept her from too much regretting the interesting world she had left, although she occasionally complains of the overwhelming numbers of her children, of whom she had eleven. And quiet as was that life, throughout amid the family and social chat of her correspondence, we hear echoes of the giant strife roaring round the ocean frontiers of our land, and feel the thrill first of an immense national anxiety, then of a triumph complete beyond all expectation. Readers of Jane Austen, lovers and critics alike, have observed the singular absence of any such sense of 'eventful living' in that wonderful little world of hers. So entirely truthful is she that the omission gives us pause. We consider that the Great War lasted over a quarter of a century, that news was tardy and letters few, and we are ready to believe that, the first panic of invasion over, English people went their ordinary way, sometimes complaining of the taxes, but unheeding that the fate of their country and of the world hung in the balance. Plainly this is a part of the truth, yet those who remember the talk of men who had lived through those weighty years could not believe it to be the whole. Maria and her correspondents show that it was not. So at Steventon and Chawton it may be assumed that politics and the war had their place in men's minds, and if they have not a place in the novels of the incomparable Jane it is probably because her just artistic instinct kept them out. We have all smiled at Clarke the courtier advising her to improve her acquaintance with the Prince of Wales by writing 'a romance on the history of the House of Coburg,' and remember her own description of her work as 'painting on little bits of ivory.' The great subjects of her own time were at once too great and too temporary for the 'little bits of ivory.' Her characters,

like Shakespeare's, have to travel down the ages, and cannot be laden with baggage beyond their own personal effects. In truth, these very letters of clever men and women show how blurred and distorted are contemporary views. Even those who perceive the important issues often fail to perceive on what pegs they hang. Besides, destiny knows neither logic nor arithmetic, and in her hands two and two so often will not make four. The views of Sister Lou, now married to William Clinton—an 'agin-the-Government' sort of man—are often at variance with those of Maria, a merely moderate Whig; and it is only the inexorable illogicalness of facts which prevents Louisa from sometimes having the best of the argument. How wisely she talks about the Peace of Amiens, when we were truly in the very midst of a long series of military failures, only broken by the success of the Egyptian campaign!

It is surely a fortunate thing that France is governed by a man like Buonaparte, who has moderation to relieve us from such a war, with a couple of islands in our pockets to put John Bull in good-humour. Dismal as necessity has rendered the peace, it is absurd in the Ministerial papers insisting upon its being glorious; . . . if it had not been for the fortunate success of our Egyptian Army, how miserably must have stood the military character of England at the beginning of the nineteenth century! But I will have done. I wanted to splutter a little at the folly of the newspapers, and probably of two-thirds of the nation.

Yet, after all, it was Maria who was the prophet when she wrote:

Everybody must rejoice, everybody almost will think the terms as good as we could reasonably expect from such a powerful adversary; but I fancy very few pretend to call it a glorious peace. Buonaparte is a great man, and a hero in my opinion, but anything but a good or principled man. Therefore I think it depends very much upon whether peace or war suits him best for his private ends whether it is lasting or otherwise. Just now I suppose it flatters his vanity to be called the Pacifier of Europe, and certainly he saw no immediate prospect of conquering us. Except, however, that I don't like taxes or thousands of men killed, I am half inclined sometimes to think that war *à toute outrance* might have been safer for us than peace.

Nevertheless, so foolish a thing is party feeling, that while the war of which she had foreseen the necessity was at its height, she is found rejoicing in the death of Pitt, the only tolerably competent War Minister the country could command. Her admiration for Napoleon grew as his star declined, and some interesting matter concerning him is printed among her letters. As a Whig, and one quite ignorant of his governmental methods, she would rather have seen him on the throne of France than a Bourbon, 'if' he could be bound over to keep the peace. The more remarkable is her advocacy of his deportation to St. Helena, which at this distance of time appears to some of us not indeed as a crime but as a blunder:

I cannot help pitying my poor friend Napoleon, but I must confess I think it is quite right to put him in a safe place, and especially not to bring him into England. There is no saying what ideas might have been hatched in

his mind upon finding himself so much the object of attention as he would have been, or indeed what ideas might have been hatched in the minds of the discontented; though I hope Englishmen, when they do rebel, will not look out of their own country for a chief conspirator.

Towards the end of Miss Adeane's volume we meet the attractive figure of John Stanley's younger brother, Edward. His son Arthur drew him in later years as Bishop of Norwich, travelling on 'John Shanks his mare' about his diocese, welcome alike to the poor clergyman buried and forgotten in its most remote parish, and to the village children who ran for their share of his jokes and his gingerbread. In the days when he was rector of Alderley while his brother reigned at the Park, he was 'the moving spirit in all the pursuits of the younger generation. They acted his plays and delighted in his stories, and he was always devising some fresh amusement and surprise for his nieces.' He had inherited his mother's 'wit and pleasantry,' with a higher stamp of character and intelligence, and, like her, he loved to travel. So in the year 1816 he determined to visit the field of Waterloo, the scene of the Armageddon of an epoch, while the earth was yet as it were warm with its blood and fire. Poor Maria! she who had witnessed with so keen an interest the opening scenes of the mighty drama ended there, how did she now envy the voyagers! But Sir John has too much business of importance to admit of their leaving home. When has not a 'rooted' man the necessary 'business of importance' to keep himself and his wife from doing anything of interest? So with a little half-comical grimace she sees the travellers set forth; Edward, his wife and a certain Donald Crauford, who had played his own small part on the 'great 18th of June' just a year before. It was to his nieces that Edward Stanley wrote the five charming and interesting letters which came to Alderley that summer. After a lively account of the adventures of the party on board a sailing ship bound for Ostend, a record of sufferings besides which those of the most detestable of modern Channel passages pale, he describes Waterloo as it was on the first anniversary of the battle:

Come, my dear Lucy, leave this novel market-place of Ghent; leave Louisa to purchase those long wicker chests full of live rabbits. . . . Let Bella superintend the sale of those dear little milk-white goats, harnessed and unharnessed; do not, by patting upon their heads that nest of pugs in a basket or that pack of curs of all shapes, sizes, and variety, lead their owners to suppose that you want to return to England like another Diana, with a kennel of hounds under your protection. . . . And now away with me to Waterloo!

We arrived at Brussels on the evening of the 17th, and at seven o'clock started for the scene of action. From Brussels a paved road with a carriage track on each side passes for nine miles to the village of Waterloo. For the first mile the country is open and diversified with fine views of the town. Straggling trees then denote the approximation of a forest, and another mile finds the traveller immersed in a long dark avenue of trees, whose shades the sun rarely penetrates, and consequently the road is scarcely ever dry. What, then, must it have been

when the accumulated baggage of 80,000 men, horses, drivers, carts, and carriages, waggons, &c., were all rushing through it at the same moment after a fall of heaviest rain!

It is without exception one of the most cut-throat looking spots I ever beheld . . . and for some days after the battle deserters and stragglers, chiefly Prussians, took up their abode in this appropriate place, and, sallying forth, robbed, plundered, and often shot those who were unfortunate enough to travel alone or in small defenceless parties.

After traversing this gloomy avenue for about four miles, the first symptoms of war met our eyes in the shape of a dead horse, whose ribs glared like a *cheval-de-frise* from a tumulus of mud. If the ghosts of the dead haunt these sepulchral groves, we must have passed through an army of spirits, as our driver, who had visited the scene three days after the battle, described the last four miles as a continual pavement of men and horses dying and dead. . . . We turned to the right down the Nivelle Road, for it was there Donald's gun was placed, and some labourers who were ploughing on the spot brought us some iron shot and fragments of shell which they had just turned up. The hedges were still tolerably sprinkled with bits of cartridge-paper, and remnants of hats, caps, straps, and shoes were discernible all over the plains. Hougoumont was a heap of ruins. . . . At the very door I stood upon a mound composed of earth and ashes, upon which 800 bodies had been burnt. Every tree bore marks of death, and every ditch was one continued grave. From Hougoumont we walked to La Belle Alliance, crossing the neutral ground between the armies; a few days ago a couple of gold watches had been found, and I dare say many a similar treasure yet remains. . . . I must carry you at once to La Haye Sainte. It was along a hedge that the severest work took place; it made me shudder to think that upon a space of fifty square yards 4,000 bodies were found dead. The ditches and the field formed one great grave. The earth told in very visible terms what occasioned its elasticity; upon forcing a stick down and turning up a clod, human bodies in an offensive state of decay immediately presented themselves. . . . We stood upon the road where Bonaparte (defended by the high banks) sent on, but *didn't* lead, 6,000 of his old Imperial Guard. They charged along the road up to La Haye Sainte, dwindling as they went by the incessant fire of eighty pieces of artillery, many of them within a few yards, till their number did not exceed 300. Then Napoleon turned round to Bertrand, lifted up his hand, cried out, '*C'est tout perdu; c'est tout fini!*' and galloped off with La Corte and Bertrand, quitting, most probably for ever, a field of battle. A continued sheet of corn-fields occupy the whole plain. The crops are indifferent, and the reason assigned is curious; the whole being trampled down last year became the food of mice, which in consequence repaired thither from all quarters, and increased and multiplied to such a degree that the soil is quite infested by them.

Upon the heights where the British squares received the shock of the French cavalry we found an English officer's cocked hat, much injured apparently by a cannon shot; it was covered with its oilskin, now rotting away, and showed by its texture, shape, and quality, that it had been manufactured by a fashionable hatter, and probably often graced the wearer's head in Bond Street and St. James's. Wherever we were, we were surrounded by boys and beggars offering eagles from Frenchmen's helmets, cockades, buttons, pistols, swords, cuirasses, and numberless other scraps and fragments. . . . I merely carried away a few bullets and eagles for Owen, a leaf of the Wellington tree for K., a piece of cartridge for you; but Donald has a nobler present for Louisa, a rib and part of the backbone of a man who was burnt at Hougoumont. '*Qu'est-ce que c'est que cela?*' said an astonished Custom officer to us as he poked it out from a corner of Donald's trunk when we were searched as we passed the frontier. Well might he ask; but I doubt whether the information conveyed in the reply gave him any particular satisfaction. . . . We started from Brussels on the 20th, again crossed the field

of Waterloo, and proceeded towards Genappe. . . . The road along which we jogged merrily and peaceably had last year on this same day been one continued scene of carnage and confusion. Prussians cutting off French heads, arms, and legs by hundreds; Englishmen in the rear going in chase, cheering the Prussians, urging them in pursuit; the French exhausted with fatigue and vexation, making off in all directions with the utmost speed. At Genappe we changed horses in the very courtyard where Napoleon's carriage was taken . . . and were shown the spot where the Brunswick Hussar cut down the French general as a retaliation for the life of the Duke. The postmaster told us what he could, and in his narrative he never called the Highland regiments 'les Ecosais,' but 'les sans-culottes.'

Then comes a visit to Paris, a Paris given over to strangers—to John Bulls, Bourbons, and returned *émigrés*:

À propos, we have seen the Bourbons. The King is a round, fat man, so fat that in their pictures they dare not give him the proper *contour de ventre*, lest the police should suspect them of wishing to ridicule; but his face is mild and benevolent. . . . Then comes the Duchesse d'Angoulême. There is no milk and water there. . . . She is called a bigot and a devotee; she has seen and felt enough, and more than enough, to make a stronger mind than hers either the one or the other. She is thin, genteel, grave, and dignified. She puts her fan to her under lip as Napoleon would put his finger to his forehead, or his hand into his bosom. . . . Then comes the Duchesse de Berri, a young, pretty thing, a sort of royal kitten; and then comes her husband, the Duc de Berri, a short, vulgar-looking, anything but a kitten he is—but *arrête-toi*. I am in the land of vigilance, and already my pen trembles, for there are gendarmes in abundance in the streets, and Messieurs Bruce & Co. in La Force, and I do not wish to join their party. In France I dare not say Bo to a goose! So, *je vous salue, M. le Duc de Berri*. . . . The constant song of our drunken soldiers on the Boulevards commenced with

Louis Dix-huit, Louis Dix-huit,

We have licked all your armies and sunk all your fleet.

Luckily the words are not intelligible to the gaping Parisians, who generally, upon hearing the 'Louis Dix-huit,' took for granted the song was an ode in honour of the Bourbons, and grinned approbation. Paris cannot know itself. Where are the French? Nowhere; all is English.

. . . About the Tuileries, indeed, and here and there a few *bien poudrés* little old men, *des bons Papas du temps passé*, may be seen dry as mummies and as shrivelled, with their ribbons and Croix St. Louis, tottering about. They are good staunch Bourbons, ready, I dare say, to take the field *en voiture*; for once, when taunted by the Imperial officers for being too old and decrepit to lead troops, an honest emigrant marquis replied that he did not see why he should not command a regiment and lead it on *dans son cabriolet*.

The last event of public interest recorded in the volume is the visit of George the Fourth to Wales. The news of Queen Caroline's death arrived while his yacht was lying at Holyhead. Sir John writes:

And where was I, who had seen the young Caroline in her fourteenth year, when her coffin lay in its state? At the very moment close to her husband's yacht, with its flag of England half-mast high. . . . I first furnished him with a newspaper which gave the account of the Queen's illness, when his yacht was entering the Bay of Holyhead. There are sometimes strange connections of moments in our life. . . . The King's visit to Holyhead and the Court of Brunswick in 1782. How different the two pictures, and what a chasm between the two was in me, between the flags half-mast high and the pale-blue gown. . . ! He was

not happy at Holyhead, nor during the remainder of his tour. He came forth to see his subjects—he shunned them; he was pleased with nothing he saw nor with anything that was done to please him.

In Miss Adeane's discreet volume the account of the Royal visit abounds with hiatus; but George the Fourth's behaviour in Wales is the secret of Polchinelle. He was, in brief, drunk and disagreeable. Arrived in Ireland, there was one of those sudden rallies which from time to time transformed the vulgar sodden wreck of a dandy into a Prince. He made speeches popular, if not profound, and got into touch with the Irish, as Englishmen incomparably wiser and better than he generally fail to do. He was soon back again in what had so long been his own Principality, storm-driven to Milford Haven, sea-sick, cross, and, as before, drunk. He drove rapidly, churlishly, through to London. To this time must belong the story of the good Welsh burgesses who went out to meet their King with a loyal address of welcome. The chief man, Mayor or what not, spoke it; but the King was speaking too. At length his reply was audible. He rose to his feet in the carriage and waved his hand towards his loving subjects: 'Drive over them!' he yelled to the coachman—supply the flowers of his speech—'Drive over them!' And so *exivit* from Wales.

The letters go no further than the year 1823; but Maria lived on into the sixties, and her house in town was one of those most frequented by Arthur Stanley, who was greatly attached to her daughter Louisa; the niece to whom two of his father's letters from abroad were addressed.

From without the Stanley circle comes yet another record, the record of a brief little episode of the kind which seem to shorten up a century, bringing as it does the generation which followed Fox in contact with that which followed Gladstone—some might say bringing the founder of the Liberal party into touch with its destroyer. But in truth a great political party has neither founder nor destroyer. It follows the laws of Nature, growing, living, dying, and leaving perchance posterity.

On reading the early letters of Maria, Gladstone wrote:

Hawarden, Dec. 21, 1896.

I have found the volume all the more interesting to me because, as a young man resident for a time at Wilmslow before going to Oxford, I was honoured by a share of the hospitalities of Alderley, and thus had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with your subject in the positions he then held.

I coveted the addition of half a dozen lines to the preface with an intimation of the course and close of her life!

It is sixty-nine years ago, but one thing I remember—the King's Speech came down. It called the Battle of Navarino untoward. Sir J. Stanley very justly ridiculed and censured the epithet.

Yours very faithfully,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

MARGARET L. WOODS.

*LEADERS OF OPPOSITION**BEFORE AND AFTER 1832*

THE conditions of Parliamentary life in England, which experienced so radical a change in 1832, have been still further modified by subsequent extensions of the Franchise, and the return of gentlemen to the House of Commons less jealous of its dignity, less imbued with its traditions, and less patient of its harness, than the members of the unreformed Parliament. Yet we still continue to talk, the same language, and to expect, apparently, that the game of party shall be played in the same way as it was under the old organisation. The present state of the Opposition in the House of Commons is often lamented, both by their friends and their opponents, and individual statesmen are censured because they do not compose their differences for the sake of the common good. But it is reasonable to ask what would be the result if they did? The party in the House of Commons might act with greater energy. But what would be the effect on the nation at large: on that final Court of Appeal by which the claims of all parties and all statesmen are now to be determined?

Much, of course, will depend on whether the leader of the Opposition is also the leader of the party, or, if not that, is recognised as its future chief. A lieutenant who is never likely to become Prime Minister occupies a very different status from one to whom the reversion of this dignity belongs as a matter of course. He can never speak with the same authority or command the same ready obedience. But we see that even before 1832 the Opposition in the House of Commons could hardly be led to victory by men of this description—that is, by mediocrities, who never aspired to anything beyond a seat in the Cabinet, even if they got that. And how much more so must this be the case now? Nobody ever supposed that, whatever might befall the Government, the Prince Regent would send for either Mr. Ponsonby or Mr. Tierney. Yet there are frequent references to both in the memoirs and diaries of the period, from which we learn that they were thought to be doing all that was necessary. But how much was that? Were they not, as agents of a great aristocratic

firm, in much the same position as the clerk to a great City company, or the chairman of a board of directors, expected to be its spokesman and representative on necessary occasions, to thoroughly understand its business, to keep the party straight on points of order and procedure, to direct its tactics, and to maintain its discipline: but not to control its policy or decide between questions of principle? In those days the Opposition in the House of Commons was much more homogeneous than it is now, and though there were very important public questions before the Legislature, the working classes had little or no share in political life; they had no votes, nor did either party think of appealing to them. Under these conditions a good general of division, in default of a greater man, could keep things going. The Whig party held together of its own accord, with little help from its leaders. There was no centrifugal tendency to be reckoned with, as there is now. The Opposition were a family party, and Paterfamilias might be only a mild old gentleman, and sometimes dispensed with altogether. And another difference was this. Ever since the break-up of All the Talents in 1807, the Whigs had been in such a hopeless position that, except by the direct favour of the Crown, they had no chance of regaining office. This failed them in 1812 and again in 1820. Something like despair began to pervade their ranks, and took all the fight out of them. What were they to gain by attacking a Government apparently founded on a rock, over which the fiercest hurricane of eloquence and passion swept in vain? After Mr. Tierney's retirement from the leadership in 1821, the post remained vacant for nine years. Everyone 'led for himself.' And it was not till towards the end of George the Fourth's reign that the Whigs became conscious that this would not do, and that there must be someone speaking in the name of the party to face the Government in the House of Commons. A few nights afterwards, says Lord Althorp's biographer, 'he availed himself of a casual opportunity in the House to say, with reference to a statement of Sir Robert Peel's, "I give notice that we intend to take the sense of the House on this question."' Lord Portman tells me that he cannot forget Sir Robert Peel's start when Lord Althorp uttered the word "we."

With the Reform Bill of 1832 the system under which the aristocracy exercised a direct control over the House of Commons came to an end, and with it the position of party leaders as their nominees and representatives. Different statesmen would partake more or less of this character according to their individual abilities and force of character, but even Mr. Pitt had to secure the support of the great Tory nobles before taking any decisive steps. Sir Robert Peel told this to Lord Stanhope. This was now at an end. A new electorate occupied the field, demanding new qualifications in party leaders, and more especially in leaders of Opposition, and since that time Opposition, roughly speaking, has passed through two

phases. In the first the leaders were representatives of highly important interests, or powerful classes of society. In the second they became leaders of the people. As the Whig party, under pressure from their extreme wing, gravitated towards Radicalism, the middle classes, who had given them the victory, began to gravitate towards Conservatism, and Sir Robert Peel soon found himself the representative of that cautious, prudential, and practical spirit which hates above all things whatever tends to unsettle society. The Reform Bill had been necessary to give them their rights, and with these they were satisfied, and only listened very coldly when told of the rights of other classes. Sir Robert Peel, both as leader of the Opposition and head of the Government, appealed to this class. They required a leader reflecting their own temperament; and in exposing the financial errors of the Government and their so-called reckless foreign policies—so very unsettling—Sir Robert suited them exactly, and was in his own element as well.

This was the second phase in the history of Parliamentary Opposition which we are here considering. But besides being the representative of the middle-class idiosyncrasy in general, Sir Robert Peel had become identified with a particular interest in the country which it was not always easy to reconcile with allegiance to commerce. He ultimately fell between the two stools. But while he led the Opposition from 1835 to 1841 the antagonism between the two was not felt. And Sir Robert could pose as the champion of Protection without forfeiting the confidence of the great commercial centres. Not, indeed, that these had altogether discarded their old allies. When Lord John Russell became leader of the Opposition he still enjoyed a considerable amount of support among the great mercantile and banking interests. In 1841 he was returned for the City of London with Mr. Masterman, a Conservative. Manchester was faithful to the Whigs. Lord John, like Sir Robert Peel, had a large outside public to appeal to, and though not considered an able financier, he was held to be sound on those questions of political economy which were now beginning to interest the middle classes. At this time what Mr. Cobden said of him on his return from Vienna in 1855 was perfectly true. He described him as a statesman round whom the hopes and sympathies of a great nation had gathered for many years. He then occupied a position quite distinct from that of any leader of Opposition in the immediate pre-Reform era. He was a statesman who touched the national heart, and had appealed to the electorate created by the Reform Bill with such effect that at the time of the Crimean embroglio of 1855-56 it was said, both by Lord Clarendon and Lord Palmerston, that no Liberal Government had a chance of standing without him. Lord John, too, besides his appeal to middle-class Liberalism, had other sources of strength to rely upon in the possession of

qualities which the English people always appreciate and applaud. He was eminently a fighting leader: his courage was proverbial: and the gallantry with which he stood up to Sir Robert Peel under the most unfavourable circumstances has been described by one who owed great part of his own popularity to the same quality. Speaking of Lucian Gay's impersonations at Coningsby Castle, Mr. Disraeli wrote, 'After enduring for hours in sarcastic silence the menacing finger of Sir Robert shaking over the green table, and appealing to his misdeeds in the irrevocable records of Hansard, Lord John himself could not have afforded a more perfect representation of pluck.' Lord John, with many defects, was a statesman who, in his best days, stirred the people more deeply than Peel ever did, a power which made up for the difference between them in other respects. But both alike had to hold themselves answerable to a public opinion unknown to the Ponsonbys and Tierneys. They could not rely only on the efficient discharge of certain regulative functions. They were the spokesmen of great interests: whereas in the unreformed Parliament the slavery question, religious disabilities and Parliamentary reform had been left very much in the hands of private members—Whitbread, Sir James Mackintosh, Wilberforce, and later on Lord John himself being the men who really guided opinion on these subjects. But Lord John Russell, who had carried the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and had led the assault on rotten boroughs, had acted strictly as a private member, not speaking in the name of his party at all.

The weakness of Mr. Disraeli as leader of the Opposition during this second or middle period, lying between the two Reform Bills of 1832 and 1867, consisted in the fact that he was not in a position to appeal to the constituencies on any such grounds as were possessed by Sir Robert Peel or Lord John Russell. When Protection was finally disposed of, the country gentlemen were for a time without a flag: he had not the confidence of the commercial Conservatives, like Peel; nor of the Church, like Gladstone; nor of the great Non-conformist interest, like Lord John. His strength lay in himself, in his tact, sarcasm, and eloquence, his indomitable fortitude, perseverance, and self-confidence. These assuredly were qualities well calculated to excite the sympathies and charm the sense of humour, which the English people possess in a high degree, and the working class in a higher degree than the middle class. But probably Mr. Disraeli's career stood him in as good stead as his moral and intellectual attractions. The romance of his life touched the popular imagination: though it did not perhaps equally affect the constituencies to which the Liberal party owed its Parliamentary predominance for nearly forty years. It was perhaps the consciousness of possessing this hold on the heart of the democracy, less powerful than Mr. Gladstone's in his better days,

but still very real and very natural, which made Mr. Disraeli the ablest leader of Opposition which the nineteenth century produced, in spite of the one great want which he experienced at the beginning of his labours. There is no necessity to dwell on his success within the walls of the House of Commons. Our object is to show that as soon as power fell into the hands of a class on whom the novelty and dignity of his ideals, his mastery over the passions, and his appeal to wider and more generous theories of political life than the *bourgeoisie* were capable of entertaining were lost, the leader of Opposition almost immediately attained the object of his ambition, and after a short delay, during which the necessary homage was paid to the cheap breakfast table, became Prime Minister with a powerful majority in the House of Commons.

Of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Hartington as leaders of Opposition from 1874 to 1880 it is difficult to speak, because neither was in full possession of the post. Mr. Gladstone retired into the background after a short trial of it and sulked in his tent, leaving to Lord Hartington all the mechanical duties of Opposition. But he was felt when he was not seen : and seems in some respects—though the motive may be fanciful—to have occupied a position during these six years not unlike that of Lord Chatham in the days of his seclusion. Lord Hartington accepted the position assigned to him with great loyalty. But under these conditions it was difficult for him to do himself justice, even had he cared to come more prominently forward, which, to judge from his own words at a later period of his life, he probably did not.

It seems to the present writer that since the Reform Bill of 1867, and still more since the Reform Bill of 1884, a leader of Opposition must succeed as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli succeeded, or not at all. The successive changes which have passed over the House of Commons during the last two generations seem to have made two qualities indispensable to a successful leader of Opposition : one is the power of appealing to the passions and the imagination of the masses ; the other that he shall be a thoroughly fighting man. Just one generation has passed away since we entered on the third of the three political periods to which this article refers, when power, which in 1832 had passed from the aristocracy to the middle class, passed from the middle class to the democracy. The only really efficient leaders of Opposition which we have seen from the beginning of it are the two statesmen we have named. Assuredly either Sir Stafford Northcote, or Mr. Forster, or Sir William Harcourt, or Lord Rosebery, or Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, would have been fully equal to all the duties of the position down to 1867. But did they, or could they, wield the wand of the magician which alone can ensure nowadays the cheerful and cohesive allegiance of large masses ? Could any of the three last-mentioned touch the national

heart as Mr. Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield touched it? Would they have any chance of 'sweeping the board'? Something, therefore, is now demanded from the leader of Opposition which was not absolutely essential from 1832 to 1867, and before that time was not necessary at all. He must have the power of infusing into great multitudes a belief in his royalty; that is, in his possession of qualities which raise him far above the level of ordinary able men and give him, as it were, a kind of divine right to leadership. When he speaks they must listen as to one inspired. When he acts they must follow him without question or hesitation. Such is the ideal leader of Opposition in a semi-democracy such as England has now become. Mere convenience, expediency, legislative ability, experience, tact, temper—these are not enough. Like the man of wit and wisdom described by Wandering Willie in *Red-gauntlet*, he must be 'as a god' unto his party.

It may be difficult or impossible to find more than a few such men in a century. But in proportion as we recede from this ideal, and are obliged to content ourselves with the nearest approach to it that we can get, the greater will be the difficulty of organising Opposition under our present Parliamentary system. There is also another point to be considered before we have done with our comparison. The leader of Opposition at the present time is required more than ever to be a fighting man, and for this reason: under the old *régime* Ministries continued in office for long terms of years, and it was not taken for granted that there would be a change of Government at every fresh General Election. Of recent years this has seemed to be the rule. However large the majority with which a Government may start on its career, it is no guarantee of its permanence. The faggots now are so much more loosely tied together than they used to be, that a little thing will scatter them. It is incumbent, therefore, in the leader of Opposition to keep his men in fighting order, and to lose no opportunity of weakening or discrediting the Government, so that on the next appeal to the country they may come before the public with more or less ragged reputations, and give the people an excuse to indulge that love of change which has often more to do with majorities and minorities than any great popular demand. In Mr. Disraeli the party had as good a fighting man as it is possible to conceive; and Sir William Harcourt would be nearly, if not quite, as good, if he could get over the initial difficulty, and clothe himself with a little divinity.

It may be said that the above applies just as much or as little to the head of a Government as to the statesman in command of his opponents. But this is not exactly true. Every head of a Government has, in virtue of his office, an authority and a power which ensure him a certain degree of respect. A Prime Minister is all the better for finding his way to the hearts of the people as well as to their

reason. But the responsibilities of government are so heavy, the interests entrusted to the head of it of such overwhelming importance, and the dangers to be feared from a rash or experimental policy are so serious, that a Minister who shows himself capable of sustaining this great burden, and whose sagacity and discernment have stood the test of long experience, may rely on popular support, though he have not all the qualities essential to an Opposition leader. It is to be remembered, moreover, that Governments are necessities of national life. Oppositions are not. They are found practically convenient, but they form no part of the theory of constitutional government, and therefore, if we are to have them at all, we must have them of the best. We may say of an Opposition leader what Horace said of poets. And though there are plenty of poets and plenty of statesmen to contradict his maxim, there is an amount of truth in it which will usually be apparent when it is put to the test.

In the House of Lords the differences to which we have called attention are, of course, much less marked than in the Commons. It is possible that Lord Derby was better fitted for Opposition than for office. It is certain that he liked it better, and he played the part to perfection in the limited scope which was allowed by the Upper Chamber. He would have made a good Opposition leader in the Commons, for he combined the fighting qualities which are wanted there with brilliant oratory and sparkling wit. But even he had not the one thing which has now become necessary above all others, and which Mr. Disraeli had—the power of enlisting popular sympathy, and the divine spark which, as Mr. Trollope puts it, made a statesman the king of his party.

The whole attitude of the English people, and especially of the working classes, towards the House of Commons has completely changed of late years. They no longer accept it as existing by the laws of Nature, an immovable institution which we must take as we find it—if in a bad state, so much the worse; if in a good one, so much the better. When it was something beyond their reach, existing in quite a separate sphere, they looked up to it with great respect, if not with any particular affection. But nowadays when it is brought down to their level, and they have become familiarised with all its doings, they demand realities; that is to say, for instance, a leader of Opposition must be able to say very clearly what and why he opposes, and where he strongly disapproves he must strike hard. It is doubtful whether Sir Robert Peel's conduct of the Opposition from 1833 to 1835 would have met with the approval of the present constituencies, or with the advanced wing of either party in the House. Sir Robert told Croker in 1833, early in the first session of the Reformed Parliament, that he could have turned out the Government easily, if he had chosen to avail himself of the Radical discontent. This kind of self-denying ordinance, however politic or prudent, would hardly be

appreciated now by those who turn the scale at an election. We doubt if any influential member of Opposition would venture now to play the part of Mr. Walpole in 1862, when, in the language of Mr. Disraeli, 'the favourite bolted.'

To apply the above remarks as briefly as may be to the present situation, if we have no statesman in Opposition capable of influencing the masses as Mr. Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield influenced them, or the middle classes as Sir Robert Peel and Lord John Russell influenced them, it does not seem to matter very much who assumes the office of Opposition leader: and we scarcely see why they should not go on without one as in the reign of George the Fourth. We say *if* we have no statesman, because it is far from the present writer's intention to assert that none such is in existence. Lord Rosebery is only fifty-three, nearly twenty years younger than Lord Palmerston when he first became Prime Minister, and ten years younger than Mr. Disraeli when he fought his Reform Bill through the Commons in 1867, and laid the foundations of a new party. Sir William Harcourt, that veteran sabreur who has so many points in common with one whom he greatly admired, Lord Beaconsfield, is turned seventy, as indeed was Lord Palmerston in 1855: but Lord Palmerston had a much easier bed to lie upon as Prime Minister than Sir William would have as leader of Opposition; and as—to borrow his own language—'the distracted sections and conflicting interests' with which the leader of Opposition in the House of Commons has now to deal are not at all to his taste; and as years pass by so rapidly, we can hardly hope to see him in the seat for which in many respects he is so well qualified.

The Conservative party had been spoiled by Lord Beaconsfield for any other leader of Opposition, and it was unfortunate for Sir Stafford Northcote that he succeeded to the post just when the particular qualities in which his old leader excelled all mankind were in special request. His five years' of term office seems to illustrate and confirm very strongly what has been above written. In many respects he was an excellent leader. His conduct of the Bradlaugh case was distinguished by great tact, firmness, and moral courage. This was universally allowed, and he led the attack on the Government so well that Mr. Gladstone, with an overwhelming force at his back, could only muster a majority of three on the great division of the Session. It is true that on this occasion he may have felt that he had in Mr. Gladstone only a half-hearted opponent to deal with, and there can be no doubt that many other opportunities occurred during Mr. Gladstone's second administration, of which Lord Beaconsfield would have availed himself to tear the Government to pieces. Whatever may be the verdict of posterity, we certainly saw in Sir Stafford Northcote a statesman who, with all the requisite experience and political knowledge, with a perfect temper, a sufficient

command of the eloquence which is appreciated by the House of Commons, and a character which, like Lord Althorp's, was formed to inspire both confidence and affection, failed nevertheless as a leader of Opposition, not only for want of that fighting spirit, that dauntless and eager love of combat which marks the man who 'drinks delight of battle with his peers,' but also for want of that something else, that spark of genius which lifts a man above his fellows, compels homage, silences criticism, and rescues failure from contempt. Sir Stafford, it was said, might have done very well for 'quiet times.' But shall we ever have quiet times again, in that sense of the word, at least? With our present constituencies, with the whole nation looking on at the great Parliamentary conflict, the leader of Opposition must be a man to evoke cheers from one end of the kingdom to the other, and not merely from the tenants of a single chamber at Westminster. Leaders must play to the gallery as well as to the stalls, if they are really to ride on the crest of the wave. They must give their vast audience something for their money. The working man does not support this or that leader of Opposition because he is cautious, sagacious, or conciliatory. The challenger must strike the shield of the noblest among his adversaries with the sharp point of his spear, or he will gain no sympathy from the masses. Every man of course must bide his time and his opportunities. He must have a fair field and a worthy cause to show what stuff he is made of, and it is unfair to judge him till he has had his chance. It is no injustice to the present leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons to say that he has still his spurs to win. With the new Parliament his real work will begin. Great allowance must be made for the very unfavourable conditions under which he enters on it. In the present disorganised state of the Liberal Party, its leader in the House of Commons is in a false position, and has to struggle with difficulties which would tax the skill and energy of the ablest statesman. If he succeeds in reuniting the two main branches of the old Liberal connection, and shows himself capable of leading it with success in the uphill battle which awaits it, it will be because he is one of those men who only show their full strength when the situation in which they are placed seems almost desperate.

T. E. KEBBEL.

ROMNEY'S PORTRAITS AT THE GRAFTON GALLERY

To pass successfully through the ordeal of two 'one-man' exhibitions within a year is certainly a test of an artist's popularity, if not of his real merit. Twice have the critics wavered, twice the public has applauded, and the authorities of the Grafton Gallery must be commended for their bold determination to hazard so much on a second throw, although it cannot be said that the later exhibition can compare with the first in representative character.

To-day, as during the painter's lifetime, there is a Romney faction as loud in his praise as the anti-Romney faction in his disparagement. 'Romney and Reynolds divide the town,' was the cry of their contemporaries, though the great painter of Leicester Square was wont to speak slightly of 'the man in Cavendish Square,' whose work he affected to despise rather than to resent. There are still those who side with Romney in the eternal rivalry of these two artists, so widely different in their aims and temperaments, yet curiously alike in certain characteristics of style and defects of workmanship. To most modern art critics and historians Romney plays a part third only to those of his great contemporaries Reynolds and Gainsborough; no mean rank either, for his life's work lay in the best years—the classical period of English Art. In popular estimation he runs even these princes of English portrait-painting hard. He was not learned, like the courtly Reynolds, whose intense and whole-hearted admiration of the old masters, while leading him into paths unexplored by Romney, led him also into dangers unknown to his rival. Reynolds in his more important works painted, as it were, with one eye on the Muses and the Royal Academy, and the other on the immortality of himself and his sitter. Romney never cared to become a member of the Academy, though he could have had the honour for the asking. Again, if Reynolds's scope was not wide Romney's limitations were all too narrow. He could no more compare with Reynolds in intellectual vigour than with Gainsborough in spirituality and magnificence of colour. Nor had he Gainsborough's quick magic to render with swift yet subtle impressionism a passing mood or the flash of a smile.

Romney was a creature of impulse, wayward and uneven in his life, as in his art, with all the merits and demerits of the so-called artistic temperament. What he lacked was the power of concentration and the intellectual grasp which should translate his impulsive conceptions into terms of pure art. Many of his greatest projects were never brought to birth. Indeed, as fast as he had thrown off a scheme, had noted an idea, new ones flocked into his fertile, if facile brain, and he was off with the old and on with the new too rapidly to do justice to either. Many and vast were the schemes he projected. Not a few of them have remained in the cartoon stage. For Romney was not to escape the contagion of his day, from which Gainsborough alone seems to have kept himself immune, the rage for historical and imaginative painting, which in the minds of his generation stood for the Grand Style and for great art. He will not live as an historical or imaginative painter, though distinctly above the rank and file of his own and a rather later day—West, Fuseli, Barry, and Haydon. Even his greatest works in these branches, ‘Shakespeare Nursed by Tragedy and Comedy,’ ‘Shakespeare and the Passions,’ both exhibited at the Grafton Gallery, interest rather than delight us, though the first is also important for its presentation of the divine Emma in yet another rôle. It is a matter for regret that his ‘Birth of Shakespeare’ and ‘Death of General Wolfe’ were neither available to add to the completeness of the two collections. Many of the pictures shown at the Grafton Gallery were exhibited there for the first time, and although it is impossible to accept all the attributions, and although many of his most famous canvases were absent, no such opportunity of judging him at his best and his worst has ever been offered in the past.

In spite of his own preference for subject pictures, expressed in a letter to his friend and future biographer Hayley—‘This cursed portrait-painting, how I am shackled with it! I am determined to live frugally, that I may enable myself to cut it short as soon as I am tolerably independent, and then give my mind up to those delightful regions of imagination’—it is above all in his essentially English character of portrait painter that Romney should be judged. One picture, indeed, at the Grafton Gallery, with figures in a hazy, brown landscape, ‘Italian Peasants Washing Linen,’ painted during a visit to Naples, and irresistibly recalling George Morland in tone and handling, is so full of life, so rich in colour, that we cannot but wish he had oftener ventured upon similar ground. It was on finding that his early heroic compositions brought him in but little that Romney, like Dick Tinto, had recourse to ‘levying that tax upon the vanity of mankind which he could not extract from their taste and liberality—in a word, he painted portraits.’ His style soon became formed and his reputation grew with equal rapidity.

He became one of the three fashionable painters of his day. For he had the magic power, the golden key to success as a portrait painter, of investing all his sitters with a beauty which we cannot believe to have been so universal as he would have us think. His sitters saw themselves depicted on his canvases in all the beauty of their own imaginative ideal of themselves. Yet nothing was more delicate or subtle than the flattery. 'I fancy,' wrote one of the most famous of them, naively enough, to her friend, 'I called up my very good looks to-day; where they came from I don't know, but my picture is certainly much improved. All seem satisfied with it. I have reason to be so, for it is handsomer than ever I was in my life.' Perhaps the artist could have solved the puzzle. In this respect how great the distance between the portraiture in vogue in Romney's day and the modern impressionist portraiture of a Sargent or a Whistler, where the sitter is merely the *Leitmotif* in a symphony of tone and colour! No wonder, then, that Romney's studio was mobbed by beauty and fashion, waiting to see their charms acknowledged, heightened, and immortalised for the benefit of themselves, their rivals, and posterity.

Much of Romney's undoubted popularity is due to his sentiment, which was indeed the sentiment of his age, to his feeling for elegance and grace, and to a refinement which, perhaps not without egoism, we are apt to regard as peculiarly English. It has even been suggested that the aristocratic ease and grace of English portraiture, so marked a characteristic of the art of Van Dyck, and often regarded as his special bequest to English painting, was indeed a native quality which the Flemish guest at the gallant Court of Charles the First was not slow to appropriate as his own from the miniature painters of this country. But it is impossible to deny Van Dyck's influence, whether consciously or unconsciously received, on the great portrait painters of the eighteenth century. Indeed, for those who, like Gainsborough, never ventured beyond the confines of their native country Van Dyck was almost the only old master whose inspiration could be readily followed. 'We are all going to heaven, and Van Dyck is of the company,' said Gainsborough in that last pathetic scene of reconciliation with his old antagonist Sir Joshua. Romney's debt to Van Dyck is equally obvious to us, if unacknowledged by him.

Romney, like Gainsborough and Reynolds, was never happier than when portraying the refined and delicate features of high-born women. These ladies of the eighteenth century breathe a charm and fragrance all their own. It is impossible to withstand the witchery of the laughing eyes and gracious brows that flash out from under the great picture-hats of Sir Duncan Hay's 'Lady Forbes' and of the 'Mrs. Robert Trotter,' or the quiet, dignified glance of Sir Blundell Maple's 'Countess of Clare,' or the half-length portrait

of 'Mrs. Lee Acton.' Peculiarly graceful, both in pose and outline, are his full-length portraits, of which there were five admirable examples in the earlier exhibition, including the famous 'Marchioness Townshend,' one of Sir Joshua's 'Three Graces of Scotland,' and the

Caroline, Duchess of Marlborough' from the Blenheim collection. Less grandiose, but perhaps even more sympathetic, are his half-lengths, in which all the artist's peculiarly sweet and tender feeling is concentrated in the face. His best portraits are not merely likenesses, but in the fullest sense pictures also. His treatment of his subject in its breadth and simplicity was eminently artistic. Here for once fashion was all in the artist's favour. The costume of the period, the soft powdered hair, the large hat or mob-cap with its touch of coloured ribbon, the simple bodice cut low about the throat, with its folds of daintily frilled muslin, and the high waists lent themselves readily to pictorial treatment. The artists of Romney's day had not, like Hals and Rembrandt, to contend with the stiffly starched ruffle, which, with its unyielding lines and aggressive whiteness, seemed to sever the head from the body; or to struggle against the too obvious disadvantages of our modern fashions, as must the men of these latter days. And though a Hals and a Rembrandt could triumph even over such obstacles as these it was fortunate that a painter of less genius should have fallen on more favourable times. No painter of portraits has ever succeeded more brilliantly than Romney in appropriating with the happiest results the picturesque costume of his contemporaries. He has been content for the most part merely to indicate the dress, and has refrained from working it out with too great elaboration. The simple white drapery he loved best to paint harmonises exquisitely with his soft background of brown trees and light, clouded sky. A touch of his favourite blue, or a glint of green in hair-ribbon or waistband, is often the only distinct note of colour in the rich scheme of the whole. How wonderful are the greys and browns of the famous 'Parson's Daughter' in the National Gallery, only relieved by the green ribbon in her hair. Equally distinguished, though far less usual, is his treatment of black, as in Mr. de Crespigny's 'Dorothy Scott,' in the earlier of the two exhibitions.

Where a considerable number of Romney's works are gathered together it is impossible to escape from the conviction that in his portraits of women there is too often an absence of characterisation, of individuality, of all the more intellectual qualities which inspire and ennoble many an otherwise uninteresting face. With his men his directness is more successful in this respect. In his portrait of 'Edward Nevinsón,' in an attitude suggesting Gainsborough, and in his 'Lee Acton,' he is objective and forceful, and his head of the philosopher in the large and somewhat theatrical 'Newton Discovering the Prism' is strong and not without dignity. But in most cases real

individuality is lacking, and his portraits have so strong a family likeness that his women might all be taken for sisters. Charm of expression, elegance, and refinement there are indeed in all his best heads, but their attitudes are of almost wearisome sameness, carefully studied, and most successful when elaborately posed. At other times, indeed, he deliberately adopts an affected naturalism, which in its apparent *naïveté* is entirely charming. But on closer scrutiny it will be found that the same eyes, nose, and mouth do duty for nearly all his heads. The straight, well defined eyebrows, the large melting eyes, and softly curved lips occur again and again, as though he had but one sample of each feature in his stock of properties. No doubt something of this monotony may be put down to his excessive devotion to his ideal type, that of the lode-star and inspiration of his best period, Lady Hamilton. But Romney, in company with all subjective artists from Botticelli to Burne-Jones, was ever, as it were, haunted by one facial type; and though, as portrait painters, they may have been hampered by their *obsession*, many of their finest inspirations have been due directly or indirectly to its influence.

The 'Simonetta' of Romney's art life was the celebrated beauty Emma Lyon, afterwards famous as Lady Hamilton and the mistress of Nelson. This remarkable woman, who ran the whole social gamut from domestic servant and painter's model to ambassador's wife and companion of queens, entirely bewitched her devoted painter. To enumerate the characters in which she sat to him were to exhaust the whole range of Classical and Christian mythology. From Innocence to Circe, from a Bacchante to Mary Magdalen, from Comedy to Cassandra, as Ariadne, Euphrosyne, Joan of Arc, Sensibility, Contemplation, and finally in her own latest rôle of Lady to Sir William Hamilton, he immortalised her undoubted and inexhaustible charms. There can be no doubt that much of Romney's success in depicting her thus variously was due to her marvellous power of completely identifying herself with the part she had for the moment assumed. Her 'Attitudes' became famous even beyond her own extensive circle of admirers. His devotion to 'this divine lady—for,' as he wrote, 'I cannot give her any other epithet, for I think her superior to all womankind'—was the main inspiration of his life, and he never handled his familiar theme with greater felicity than in the full-length portrait at the Grafton Gallery of this lady as a Bacchante leading a goat, a graceful figure in robe of deep rose, whose tints are repeated in the glories of a troubled sunset sky.

If sentiment and tenderness play an important part in Romney's female portraits they are the secret of his success as a painter of children. Like Reynolds, Romney is never more delightful than in his portrait groups of mother and child, which, had he lived some centuries earlier, would have been labelled 'Madonna and Infant

Christ.' His 'Mrs. Cumberland and Child' at the Grafton Gallery, though slight in colour, is exquisite in feeling, and the 'Mrs. Cardwaine and Child' of the earlier exhibition, and Mr. Beit's 'Mrs. Ainslie and Child,' so much admired in the British Pavilion at the Paris Exhibition, are excellent examples of his best manner. Romney loved to paint a little naked child, whether as the 'Infant Shakespeare' or 'Master Payne' with his dog, both at the Grafton Gallery. Correggio himself, who was undoubtedly Romney's inspiration herein, has scarcely surpassed the sweetness of the 'Master Russell,' lent by Mr. Holman Hunt to the earlier exhibition there. The single figure of the 'Brown Boy,' for all the inevitable comparisons it suggests, standing in an open landscape in a pathetically grown-up pose, and looking out from the picture with strange elfin eyes, is striking in its very audacity. But still more remarkable is the Duke of Sutherland's great group of 'Children of the Stafford Family' dancing in a ring, which was seen at the Old Masters in 1876, and again in the autumn of last year in the loan collection of English portraits at Birmingham. Here Romney, in beauty of composition, in freedom of flowing line, rises to his highest, and, as in his 'Serena in the Boat of Apathy' at the Grafton, proves that there were moments when he could pit himself without fear against the best of English painters.

But in common with some of the greatest masters of the English School he was limited by a deficient training in the very elements of the painter's art. It is as a draughtsman that Romney has been most severely criticised. Reynolds himself sadly confessed that never having been through the schools he knew little or nothing of anatomy, and Romney's experience was even more limited by his lack of perseverance as well as of opportunity. His forms consequently tend to be unmodelled and boneless; his heads and necks are often flat and not in true perspective. Even his draperies are sometimes, as in the 'Cassandra,' stiff and clumsy. The very breadth and simplicity which we admire in his pictures degenerated at times into empty and meaningless generalisation. His charming sketchiness was often mere powerlessness to finish. His hands lack shape and characterisation. His figures often want depth and roundness. The modelling of the face where indicated at all is frequently blocked in with warm, deep shadows round eyes, nose, and mouth, sometimes unduly exaggerated, as in his more *bravura* portraits, like that of Lady Hamilton as Cassandra. But what matters all this except to those pedants who demand the scientific accuracy of an early Florentine nude even in the most decoratively and broadly treated portrait of an English lady of fashion? Who cares to count the ribs of beauty, or to take thought of the muscular construction of a soft, rounded arm? That he could when he wished draw and model the figure with consummate skill is proved beyond question in his

nude drawing of Emma Harte, lent to the Grafton by Sir John Sinclair.

Romney's most purely artistic quality lies in his feeling for colour. Though his life was not, like that of Reynolds, devoted to the quest of the golden secret of the Venetians, and though he could never match Gainsborough's swift lightness of touch and shimmering silver harmonies, his colour is nearly always pleasing and sometimes entirely beautiful. If occasionally somewhat shallow it is always effective. His favourite theme, on which he played many a variation, was a blending of the mellow white and cool blue of the dresses, the warm chestnut and grey of the powdered hair against backgrounds of browns of wonderful variety and softness. Indeed in his setting of his figures he showed the greatest skill and took no small pains to bring his subject into harmony with its surroundings. He especially favoured soft, brown trees in his backgrounds, using them to set off the face, or placing his figure strongly against a mist of delicate shades of azure and yellow. At times his architectural backgrounds are inclined to clumsiness, and he does not altogether despise the traditional red curtain and tall pillar of an earlier generation.

It cannot be too much regretted that Romney sinned, albeit in the best of company, in the use of bitumen, an error against which many a darkened and blistered canvas to-day bears silent witness. Restoration and over-cleaning have also played their usual havoc among some of his works, which, thinly painted as they were—so much so, indeed, that the texture of the canvas is easily visible through the pigments—shine aggressively in their thick coatings of varnish, or hang dulled and faded, listlessly contemplating, as it were, the loss of their former brilliance. There are, however, no doubt many who think that, to adapt the egregious remark of Sir George Beaumont about Reynolds, 'a faded portraitt by Romney is better than a fresh one by anyone else.'

ROBERT C. WITT.

LAST MONTH

So great and absorbing are the events that have been crowded together during the last six weeks that even the young, as they look back to New Year's Day, must feel old in the experiences through which they have passed. On January 1, the newspapers talked glibly of the new century and the new era that was to be ushered in with it; and newspaper readers echoed the talk. But neither writers nor readers realised how swiftly and completely the change from one era to another was to take place, or how distant, before the new century was two months old, would seem the latest days of the century that had passed away. The Queen's death was the event that changed the whole course of the national life, and taught us all that the nineteenth century was indeed a thing of the past. Everybody, as I wrote last month, knew that in the course of nature her Majesty's life was drawing to a close; yet even this knowledge hardly dulled the pain of the blow when it fell, nor did it prepare anyone amongst us for the immensity of the change which the death of the Sovereign was to cause. Journalists for half a century had known that this event was the most important of any public incident that they could be called upon to chronicle, yet it is the common confession of the oldest and most experienced journalists of our time that, when it took place, the death of the Queen far transcended in all-absorbing interest, and in the magnitude of its consequences, their utmost anticipations. Looking back, after the lapse of a month, we can see more completely than we could at the moment the unique character of the demonstration which followed the Queen's death. It is the simple truth to say that the history of the world records nothing like it. No doubt this is due in part to the fact that the progress of science has knit the whole human family together, and brought the uttermost parts of the earth within touch of the great capitals of the Old World. But not even the wonderful facility with which the most distant races can now interchange their thoughts would have sufficed to produce that world-wide mourning which attended the passing of Victoria if she had not herself been one whom the peoples of every land had by common consent learned to respect and reverence both as queen and woman. Thus it came to pass

that for the first time in the history of the world the death of a single human being led to an instantaneous display of grief which was not only deep but common to every part of the civilised globe. It was a wonderful demonstration, and whilst we gladly claim it as being above everything else a tribute to the virtues of the Sovereign we have lost, we are justified in seeing in it also a recognition of the unique place which the British Empire holds in the commonwealth of the nations. Beside this recognition the sneers of censorious rivals fade into nothingness.

In this country we were all profoundly touched and gratified by the kindly sympathy which came to us in our sorrow, not only from every capital in the civilised world, but from the peoples of many different lands. Nowhere was more good feeling shown, or more graceful expressions of sympathy offered, than in France; and it would be sad indeed if we were likely to forget the courtesy and kindly feeling which our neighbours displayed in those dark January days. It is no exaggeration to say that they more than fulfilled the hopes of the friends of France in this country. The outburst of genuine sympathy in the United States did not of course surprise us in itself. We had known for years past that all that was best in the great Republic united in doing honour to the character and career of the Queen of England. But even Americans themselves were surprised by the spontaneity of the universal tribute which they paid to Queen Victoria on her deathbed: it was something unexampled in the history of the United States, something hardly to be explained by the blood-ties between the two countries. Politicians who are not distinguished by their optimism have seen in this outburst of fraternal sympathy and affection a far truer indication of the real temper of the American people towards the British than that which is afforded either by the speeches of senators or the acts of the executive at Washington. In those days of mourning, no Englishman resident in the United States can have felt that he was absent from home. In America also it is therefore true that the Queen's death excited far wider and deeper emotion than anyone had anticipated.

One would like to say something of the genuine sorrow which Italy showed, not merely by the acts of its Ministers and Parliament, but by the unobtrusive demonstrations that were witnessed throughout the length and breadth of the fair Peninsula. But, as a matter of fact, we have learned to regard the Italian people as being in a very special sense our friends, and we were moved, rather than surprised, by the warmth with which that friendship was expressed in our time of national sorrow. Not to speak of the other countries of the civilised world, to all of whom we owe a debt of gratitude, I must turn to the case of Germany. The visit of the German Emperor was universally recognised by the people of Great Britain as a spontaneous act of filial devotion to the Queen, and a proof of

his strong personal affection for our Royal Family. As such, it awakened among all classes a lively sense of almost personal gratitude towards his Imperial Majesty, and it swept away for ever the memory of days when the English judgment of the Emperor William was not merely severe, but to a large extent unjust. Yet, whilst we recognised his visit and his prolonged stay with our Royal Family as proof of the warmth of his affections, and of the true nobility of his character, we were not so far carried away by illusions as to regard it as an event of direct and immediate political importance. Sober-minded Englishmen could not forget the fact that the policy alike of England and of Germany must be governed by other considerations than the friendly and affectionate relations of the reigning families of the two countries. It is a good thing for the peace of Europe that such relations are maintained between Potsdam and Windsor; but in both countries questions of national importance must still be decided upon their merits, and with a strict view to the preservation of those national interests which must come first in the estimation of our respective Governments. This being the universal opinion here, it has seemed strange to us that even the enlightened classes in Germany have jumped to a different conclusion, and have been filled with alarm by the fear that the Emperor's pious and affectionate visit to his mother's old home might lead to a surrender of purely German interests in favour of those of England. It is to be regretted that this alarm has been allowed to detract to some extent from the expressions of grief in Germany at the bereavement we have suffered as a nation. This, however, is a theme upon which it is unnecessary to dwell. It is sufficient to note the fact that, if many German publicists were made uneasy by the belief that grave political problems were being subjected to examination during the first days of mourning at Osborne and Windsor, others have expressed their disappointment that the Emperor's visit to our shores has not been followed by our acceptance of European intervention in South Africa. The average Englishman is content to rejoice at the thought that the Emperor William has not merely shown the warmth of his affection for those who are nearest to him in blood, but has succeeded in clearing away the clouds of prejudice which so long obscured his lofty character in the eyes of the people of Great Britain. The demonstration of hearty good will which greeted his Majesty when he passed through the streets of London on his departure is not one that can soon be forgotten on either side.

Finally, if one may sum up the lessons taught by the Queen's death, I should say that the most important of all has been the demonstration which has been afforded of the real union of the Empire over which she presided so long and gloriously. Last month I had to speak of the appearance of the streets of London when she lay dying. To-day I may tell the same tale of every city and

village over which her sway extended. In Canada, in Australia, in sorely-tried South Africa, in India, and in the islands of the main, all divisions caused by race or distance seemed to be obliterated, and we had the wonderful spectacle of an Empire united through all its millions as one man by a common feeling of love and loyalty.

No more signal proof of the fact that we have entered not merely upon a new reign, but a new era, could be wished for than that which is afforded by the ceremonies of the month. It is true that the first and greatest of these ceremonies, the Queen's funeral, belonged rather to the old reign than the new. But even in it there was something more than the hint of change. The Queen, by her own desire, had a soldier's funeral, and her people, as they attended in countless hosts the passage of her coffin from Osborne to Frogmore, were witnesses of a naval and military pageant the like of which has never been seen before. It was fitting that the ruler of the greatest naval Empire the world has ever known should be carried across the Solent under the protecting shadow of the great warships that form the material bulwark of the State. But it was a novel spectacle that was offered in London when the funeral procession of an English Queen was formed almost exclusively of armed men, representing the flower of our army. But for one all-sufficing fact, this solemn and stately pageant might have conflicted with the popular conception of the Queen's life and character. That fact was the aspect of the people of London as the glittering procession passed through the streets. They had gathered in multitudes not to be numbered; terrible and almost sublime in their immensity, but infinitely more impressive in their silence and their grief. On the coffin which contained the beloved remains, the splendid regalia of the sovereignty of England lay exposed to view, but no one had eyes for the glittering crowns with their jewels of fabulous price, or for orb and sceptre with their mystic significance. The one thought of the men and women who formed that wonderful crowd seemed to be for that which was contained within the coffin. The Queen was passing through her capital for the last time, and it was of her, not of the martial hosts by whom she was attended, not of the panoply of royal magnificence that covered her bier, hardly even of the King and the company of monarchs and princes who surrounded him, that all men thought. The greatness of a nation's grief absorbed even the grandeur of the military spectacle and the brilliancy of that unparalleled band of mourners. It was the Queen, the Queen alone, who on this last sad day commanded the homage of every heart.

But since then London, at all events, has been living in a whirl of regal ceremonies that has opened the eyes of many, for the first time in their lives, not only to the antiquity, but to the significance of the monarchy. The Proclamation of King Edward the Seventh came too quickly after the severe blow of the Queen's death to be

fully appreciated even by those who saw the ceremony, with its paraphernalia of quaintly bedizened heralds and pursuivants. Judging from the Press, I should say that this particular ceremonial made a deeper impression abroad than at home. The Continental and American illustrated newspapers were full of it, and of the symbolism of the ancient procedure. The opening of Parliament by the King in person was, however, another matter. It was something the full significance of which every Englishman could grasp. It was, at the same time, conclusive proof of the fact that the Court, so long practically invisible, is once more amongst us with all its ancient splendour restored. For many years past London has known practically nothing of the pageantry of a Court. The two Jubilee processions were really the only spectacles in which the full resources of the English Court, so far as ceremonial is concerned, had been revealed to this generation. For the rest, they read in the *Court Circular* the sober chronicle of the Queen's doings, and though they learned from it something of the dignified state in which the Sovereign spent her days, they saw nothing of it for themselves. All this has been changed in a day by the event of the 22nd of January. The Court has suddenly become a reality, and the outward magnificence of the English Crown has been made visible to everybody. For the moment the effect of the transformation is slightly bewildering—as that of transformation scenes generally is. We had been so long accustomed to the subdued tones of Windsor and Osborne in the old reign that the sudden blaze of light and colour which has ushered in the new is more than a little dazzling. No one can predict what may be the ultimate effect of the changed order. If we cannot forget that the influence and popularity of the Crown were never so great as during the years of Queen Victoria's widowhood, we cannot, on the other hand, shut our eyes to the fact that the nation loves a spectacle when it is one of solid magnificence and when it represents an institution that is great in reality as well as in outward form. From time immemorial men have agreed to regard the trappings of royalty as being inseparable from royalty itself. That they are not an essential part of the institution to which they belong our experience during the past forty years has proved. But it may well be doubted whether the Crown could afford for more than one generation to conceal its external splendours from the public eye. In any case, it will be admitted that Edward the Seventh has merely been faithful to the duty which his great office imposes upon him by restoring to us the full ceremonial of a Court. For the present, of course, that ceremonial is affected by the national mourning, but even now it is clear that no 'maimed rites' will be tolerated in the performance of the external duties of the sovereignty. The fine pageant which the people of London witnessed on the day when the new Session of Parliament was opened

was startling in its novelty to those who beheld it for the first time. Yet we have to recognise the fact that in future such pageants will be the ordinary accompaniment of the movements of the Sovereign on all State occasions. In this respect at all events we are already separated by an immeasurable gulf from the old century and the old era.

By universal consent King Edward, in the discharge of the serious duties of the kingly office, has shown brilliant tact, great dignity and a strong sense of the gravity of the responsibilities now laid upon him. His first speech, at the Accession Council, on the morrow of the Queen's death, won the sympathy and admiration not only of those who heard it, but of all who afterwards became acquainted with it. The sincerity of the speaker was manifest to everybody, and it was a sincerity which revealed at the same moment deep personal feeling, a full recognition of the great duties and responsibilities of the position to which he had been called, and a touching personal modesty that threw into yet higher relief the splendour and loneliness of the monarchy. Since then in his messages to his people within the limits of the three kingdoms and beyond the seas, to his Indian subjects, and to the Navy and Army, he has consistently maintained the key-note thus struck in his first speech after coming to the throne. All the world knows that his expressions of grief for the loss of his revered mother sprang from his heart, and no one doubts that his repeated declaration of his resolve to follow in her footsteps as a constitutional monarch—'a sound constitutional Sovereign' is said to have been the phrase he used in his first speech to the Privy Council—comes from the heart also. That he understands and appreciates the greatness of the position to which he has been called has been made clear from his statements in the past as well as from his actions during the last month. The monarch is no lay figure, even in a country in which the constitution commands universal respect. A great part in the national life lies before King Edward, and if he is to be judged by his utterances since he came to the throne, and by the testimony of those who know him, it is evident that he means to fill it worthily—as his mother did before him. We have not enjoyed as many days of his reign as we had years of the Queen's; but already the country is beginning to feel that he is entitled not merely to the respect which is the due of his august position, but to the affectionate confidence of the people over whom he rules.

One of the first duties of the House of Commons in the present Session will be to make adequate provision for the Civil List of the Crown. It is part of the inestimable legacy which Queen Victoria has left to her successor that this question will not now excite the feeling that it would certainly have caused in days not very far distant. The cheeseparing policy which twenty years ago a

considerable section of the electors were anxious to apply even to the revenues of the Crown no longer finds favour with the public. Those of us who remember how stoutly Mr. Gladstone had to fight to bring his followers into line on the question of the royal grants must feel that the times are changed indeed when not a murmur of discontent is heard in connection with the approaching re-settlement of the personal revenues of the Crown. The common-sense of the nation enables it to recognise the fairness of the demand that full provision shall be made for the proper maintenance of the monarchy. Men of all parties now agree that it would be insufferable if the greatest of the world's Empires were to deal in a grudging and parsimonious spirit with the Sovereign who is its supreme representative and chief. Most also recognise the fact that even in palaces the cost of living has become greater since Queen Victoria's reign began, and that the incomes of private persons have advanced, whilst that of the Sovereign has been standing still. All these considerations have had the effect of preparing the public mind for the discussion of the question of the Civil List. That it will not pass without some discussion is certain; but so far as appears at present the discussion will turn upon the amount by which the Civil List of the last reign must be augmented to meet the necessities of the new *régime*. Yet whilst there is every disposition to deal fairly and liberally with the new Sovereign there is a strong feeling in many quarters that advantage should be taken of the re-settlement of the revenues of the Crown in order to put an end to any expenses that are not merely extravagant in themselves, but useless and even mischievous in their character. Much was done in the early years of the Queen's reign to reform the abuses which grow up in every Court, and all that was done was for the benefit of the Queen herself. It is probable that the process of reform will now be carried further, and that some of those encumbrances of the Court which are neither useful nor ornamental will be swept away. For the moment all parties in the House of Commons seem to be united as to one quarter in which the hand of reform should make itself felt. It was unfortunate on many grounds that when the King commanded the attendance of his faithful Commons to hear the Speech from the Throne, the accommodation provided in the House of Lords for the members of the other Chamber should have been hopelessly and ludicrously inadequate. It may be—though this is doubtful—that precedent was strictly followed in the steps taken by the responsible authorities with regard to the admission of the members of the House of Commons to the King's presence. But even that fact did not soften the indignation of men who, having filled some of the highest offices in the service of the State, found themselves roughly hustled and crushed in a vain attempt to obey the royal command. The King himself has been moved by the

knowledge of what happened, and by his command a Joint Committee of the two Houses will be formed to consider in what way scandals of the same kind may be avoided in the future. It is not improbable that the suggestion that Westminster Hall, the scene of so many gatherings of historic interest, shall be used when Parliament is opened by the Sovereign will be adopted. But the question of the maintenance of great hereditary offices in connection with the Court, the holders of which are almost necessarily unequal to the duties they have at rare intervals to perform, will possibly obtrude itself into the discussion of the Civil List.

The opening night of debate in Parliament showed that the main topic of political interest is still the war in South Africa. The news from the scene of operations during the past month has been very scanty. Indeed, for several days after the Queen's death, hardly a word was transmitted either from official or unofficial sources, and dark rumours of disaster in consequence became general. These rumours were happily unconfirmed; but it is clear that Lord Kitchener is resolved not to raise any hopes in the minds of the people at home that events may falsify. He confines himself to the bare recital of actual facts, and the story is often told so briefly as to be almost unintelligible. We know, however, that the guerilla warfare is still being kept up under the leadership of Commandants Botha and De Wet, and that Cape Colony has not yet been cleared of the enemy. The adroitness of De Wet in avoiding any pitched battle with our troops, whilst inflicting almost continuous damage upon our lines of communication and the property of loyal farmers and citizens, is as extraordinary as ever. But in spite of this discouraging fact it is clear that the steady pressure which is being applied to the guerilla forces by Lord Kitchener and General French is gradually weakening the enemy both in men and ammunition. In the Transvaal the country is being cleared by our troops over a wide area, so that the Boers must be increasingly hampered in their movements by want of supplies. But this process of clearing the country is carried on at a cost which can hardly be calculated. It means the ruin of a vast territory where two years ago comparative wealth and prosperity were universal. That the process is inevitable if the war is to be brought to a successful close hardly makes it less hateful and painful. In the meantime, the reinforcements which ought to have been sent out to South Africa at least three months ago are being at last sent forward. The response of the Yeomanry and the Volunteers to the appeal of the Government, if not up to the high pitch of January 1900, has still been remarkable—all the more remarkable because the private letters from soldiers at the front have dispelled any illusions as to the nature of the task entrusted to them. But the work of preparing the new levies for their duties in the field takes time, and it will be many weeks before Lord Kitchener

will really have at his disposal the full body of 30,000 mounted troops for which he has asked. By-and-by the nation will want to know the true reason for the failure of the War Office to furnish these reinforcements at an earlier date. The only explanation which is now offered is the thrice-familiar plea of miscalculation. Ministers declare that when they announced to the country last September that the war was virtually over they really believed that this was the case, and were in no sense prepared for the recrudescence of the conflict under the auspices of Botha and De Wet. Thus another is to be added to the long list of the blunders into which the Government has fallen with regard to South Africa.

Popular feeling in this country not merely takes account of these administrative mistakes, but of some special features of the struggle during its latest phases. Of these the most important is the treatment which Commandant De Wet accorded to the peace envoys who visited his camp. Upon this subject we have had a hot controversy at home. It is unfortunately not a controversy that can really be settled in the light of the information that we at present possess. That De Wet behaved with great barbarity in shooting men after flogging them is generally admitted. But the question of whether he went beyond the usages of civilised warfare in treating the peace envoys as spies is not a question that can be decided until we know the exact mission of these men and the manner in which they sought to discharge it. The ardent pro-Boer has not waited to ascertain his facts before pronouncing judgment. He decides summarily that the envoys were tampering with the loyalty of De Wet's soldiers, and that they only met the fate which would have overtaken them if, in similar circumstances, they had fallen into the hands of Wellington in the Peninsula. More reasonable persons will wait for the full evidence before deciding either for or against De Wet on this very grave charge.

But whether De Wet were or were not technically justified in putting a summary end to the efforts of the peace envoys, one point is clear. That is, that whilst he is inspired by this fierce determination to suppress every movement in favour of peace, there is very little prospect of being able to secure his attention to peace overtures by whomsoever they may be made. This country is naturally and properly impatient at the continuance of the war. It longs for its conclusion and would welcome any steps by which that conclusion could be reached with honour and safety. But the majority of Englishmen of both parties are convinced that no greater evil could befall us than a peace which left the main question at issue unsolved. It has pleased some representative Little Englanders to find fault with a phrase used by Sir Henry Fowler in a speech at Wolverhampton, when he said that we must 'fight to the finish.' These gentlemen seem to think that an unfinished fight would be a satisfactory end to a

struggle in which two rival races have been competing for the mastery. One wonders what would have been the history of the United States during the last thirty years if the Civil War had not been fought to the finish. We are told, however, that it is the bounden duty of the Government to open negotiations with the Boers still in the field, and that we have no right to allow ourselves to be deterred even by De Wet's truculent dealings with the peace envoys. Probably most would agree that this is sound advice, provided there were any hope that a basis for negotiations could be arrived at. Unfortunately, however, De Wet's manner of repelling the advances of the messengers of peace is not the only obstacle to successful negotiation with him. Like Mr. Kruger in his placid retirement at the Hague, he has adopted as his own the formula of 'absolute independence' for the Boer States. We, on the other hand, are committed to the directly opposite formula of complete annexation. It is too late now to recede from this condition, which, it must be remembered, has received the sanction of the leading men of both political parties in this country. Within the limits of this condition the feeling of Englishmen—a feeling which it is clear is shared by members of the Government—is in favour of granting the widest possible range of liberty to the people of the Boer States, as well as to the other peoples of South Africa. But the English flag must continue to fly at Pretoria and Bloemfontein, and no question of any interference by an outside Power with our sovereignty must be admitted within the range of possibility. This is the irreducible minimum of the demands which England makes. If she secures it she will have fought to the finish, and will have won the victory. To many sympathisers with the Boers, both in this country and in South Africa, to many who are opposed to the policy of the Government in its past dealings with the Transvaal, and who regard Mr. Chamberlain's diplomacy as a miracle of misconception and mismanagement, these terms seem to be not only fair and reasonable but essential to the future peace. But is De Wet prepared to negotiate on this basis? Apparently not; for he still clings to his formula of 'absolute independence.' This is the reason which leads so many who long for the termination of a bloody and exhausting war to feel that there is still no road to a settlement save that which the Army can make for us.

The speeches by the leaders of the two Houses at the opening of the Session, with one exception, hardly reached the level of the occasion. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman made a strong effort, and he had the satisfaction of achieving a distinct success, for he pleased all classes among his own followers, whilst he displeased his opponents. Lord Kimberley had the dubious satisfaction of affording at least as much gratification to the Ministerialists as to the Liberals. Mr. Balfour was in his best debating-class style, and replied to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman without answering him. Lord Salisbury,

it is to be feared, disappointed everybody, his friends as well as his opponents. His complaint of the 'impatience' of Lord Kimberley at the slow progress of the war certainly came with a bad grace from a Minister who had more than once pledged himself to the statement that the war was practically over. But that which caused most dissatisfaction in the Prime Minister's speech was the want of a firm grasp of the situation as a whole which it betrayed, and the disposition it manifested to regard the war as a mere episode in our history—something to be forgotten as soon as may be. It is difficult to believe that Ministers as a whole can share the views of their chief on this subject. If we are to go to sleep again as soon as the actual struggle in South Africa is at an end, we shall be sleeping unto death. Even the man in the street can now realise the fact that this war must of necessity be one of the turning-points in the nation's history. It has imposed the severest strain upon our defensive forces, and for the moment has completely disorganised our military system. We have narrowly escaped disasters that would have fatally compromised our prestige in the eyes of the world, and we have incurred an expenditure which must form for years to come a serious addition to the national liabilities. What would happen at this moment if, by any evil chance, we were to find ourselves involved in war with some great European Power, no one knows, though we may well shudder at the bare possibility of such an event. The one compensation for all that we have suffered in the past eighteen months lies in the fact that we have learned, in the hard school of experience, more than one lesson of vital importance to us as a people. We have been taught, for example, that our military system is at present hopelessly defective, and that it allows neither the courage of the soldier nor the capacity of the commander the fair play to which they are entitled. Yet Lord Salisbury speaks as if no lesson had been taught, no moral gathered, from the great events of the past eighteen months. We are to muddle on with the war, bringing it to an end somehow, and at some time not yet indicated, and then we are to forget it! It is not strange that those who feel most strongly the grave character of the risks we have run of late stand amazed in presence of this attitude on the part of the chief Minister of the Crown. Louder complaints were heard after Lord Salisbury's speech from his own supporters than from the members of the Opposition.

Of the general prospects of the Session there is little to be said. A widely spread conviction prevails that it is destined to be a stormy one. The chief foundation for this belief is the fact that the Irish members have returned to the House with a fighting policy and in a fighting mood. They have come back unexpectedly strong, and united upon one point at least. Mr. John Redmond's amendment to the Address calling for an immediate measure of compulsory land

purchase in Ireland was seconded by Mr. T. W. Russell, until a few months ago a member of the present Government and a strenuous opponent of Home Rule. Ireland, as was made clear both by the debate and the subsequent division, is practically united in support of this demand, and Ministers in consequence find themselves confronted by the 'squalid sphynx' of the Irish Question in its most formidable character. The failure of all the attempts of the last twenty years to grapple with the agrarian problem is admitted by everybody. The men of Ulster have now combined with the Nationalists of the South and West in presenting that problem once more to Parliament and in demanding its solution. The Irish members have thus found a policy upon which they can unite, and they are not likely to be deterred from pressing it upon us by any reluctance to disturb the repose of the Government. If the Session of 1901 is to be one of Irish obstruction persistent and resolute, like that once carried out by Mr. Parnell and Mr. Biggar, then, no matter whether anyone gains, the Government is bound to lose. Its programme of work as set forth in the King's Speech is not only modest but uninteresting. The nation will hardly become wildly excited over such topics as the constitution of the Court of Appeal or the law of literary copyright. Ministers seem to have been resolved to make their programme as colourless as possible. They have not only passed over the temperance question, about which an important section of their followers, as the debate on the Address proves, feels strongly, but have even shelved that housing of the poor question upon which the King in his excellent speech to the members of the London County Council laid so much stress. But it is a mistake for a Government, and especially for a Government with a huge but not yet fully disciplined majority behind it, to imagine that safety is to be found in a colourless and uninteresting programme. It is precisely when Ministers are engaged in bringing forward humdrum measures of secondary importance that the independent member gets the best chance of distinguishing himself. It is at such times, too, that organised obstruction is most irritating and most effective. There are many reasons therefore for the belief that despite the meagre programme of the Government the Session may be a stormy one. The Budget itself will provide many opportunities for a running Parliamentary fight which may prove as serious as the guerilla warfare in South Africa. It is not surprising, remembering all this, that rumours are current to the effect that Ministers, despite their triumph at the General Election, have entered upon the first regular Session of the new Parliament in a mood which is by no means that of cheerful anticipation.

Lord Salisbury twitted Lord Kimberley in his speech on the state of the Opposition. The facts of the case no doubt entitled him to do so. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that the divisions*

in the Liberal ranks which have already lasted so long must necessarily last much longer. Those who are acquainted with the currents of opinion in the Opposition know that there is a growing impatience with regard to the action of the extreme men of both wings of the party. The attempt to make Liberalism identical with the advocacy of the Boer cause has signally failed, and, though it may be renewed, it is not in the least likely to succeed. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's speech on the Address met with the approval of the great majority of all sections of the party, and the withdrawal of the amendment by means of which Mr. Lloyd George sought to commit the Opposition to an active policy in favour of the Boers was in itself proof of the fact that his fellow Liberals refused to support his views. It would be idle to pretend that the old differences are healed, or that the great chasm which divides the extreme men on either side has been bridged. But the Liberal centres, both right and left, have been making their influence felt since the Session began, and, as a consequence, the Opposition has gained both in strength and cohesion. The feeling among Liberals as to the blunders which Ministers have committed in connection with the war is of itself strong enough to bring about a large measure of unity. Individual Liberals may differ upon all other conceivable questions, and yet agree with one another in the belief that Ministers have committed almost every imaginable blunder in their manner of conducting the South African campaign.

Everybody knows, however, that this opinion of the way in which the Government has conducted the war is not confined to members of the Opposition. The Conservatives may be faithful to the ties of party, and yet full of unconcealed indignation at the want of foresight which Ministers have shown all through the shifting phases of the contest. One of the incidents of the month has been the publication of two huge volumes of despatches dealing with the whole course of the war down to the time when Lord Roberts returned to this country from South Africa. These despatches have done nothing to vindicate the Government from the charges which have been so constantly urged against it ever since the first days of the investment of Ladysmith. Taken in conjunction with the feeble speech of the Prime Minister at the opening of the Session, they have brought home to all of us, without regard to the divisions of party, the need for a strenuous effort to reform the evils which afflict our military system and to 'put the Empire on a business footing.' If their own followers begin to despair of getting the necessary reforms from the members of the present Government, that is exclusively the fault of the latter. The position taken up by not a few Ministers, including the Prime Minister himself, with regard to the immediate future, is eminently unsafe from the party point of view. Their belief that they may act as they please because they have to deal with nothing more than a

weak and divided Opposition may prove to be an illusion from which they may be awakened suddenly and rudely.

It would be a mistake to attach too much importance to the division in which the Ministerial majority suddenly sank to one-third of its normal strength on a question unexpectedly raised in the House of Commons with regard to what are known as 'supplementary questions.' But no one can doubt that this division bore testimony to the grave dissatisfaction of the House at the manner in which the Ministry was reconstructed after the General Election. Lord Cranborne, the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, had been asked a simple question with regard to the position of the Allies at Peking. Chinese affairs have been wrapped in a cloud of mystery for many months past, and no one can wonder at the desire of members to get as much light as possible upon a complicated and dangerous situation. Outsiders can hardly venture to criticise the course of affairs at Peking, owing to the fact that they are denied any precise knowledge of what is happening. The stories which come to us from Washington and from the capitals of Europe constantly contradict each other, and our own Ministers profess to be ignorant of facts which are asserted with the utmost confidence in the Press of many different countries. That the Chinese Government is still playing fast and loose with the demands of the Powers for the punishment of the criminals of last year, that Germany is desirous of enforcing those demands by measures which do not meet with the unanimous approval of the other Powers, and that Russia is endeavouring to make a treaty of her own on the subject of Manchuria which must be injurious to the special interests of this country, are facts that are tolerably patent to everybody. But our knowledge of the state of things does not come from the Treasury bench. Lord Cranborne professed ignorance of the expedition of the Allies into the interior of China at a time when the details of that expedition had been recorded in every newspaper. His amazing lack of information surprised and irritated the House of Commons, and when he refused to answer a simple supplementary question about China, on the ground that the Leader of the House had forbidden him to answer all such questions, an angry storm broke out that was by no means confined to the Opposition benches. It furnished, as I have said, a significant demonstration of the feeling of the House with regard to the reconstruction of the Ministry and the manner in which Mr. Balfour has sought to interpose a bar between members and the Foreign Office. In itself the incident was not of great importance, but it is a sign of the times, and of the temper of the new Parliament. It is clear already that this House of Commons is different from its immediate predecessor, and Ministers will be fortunate if further proof of the fact is not furnished before long in a fashion that cannot be agreeable to them. In any case, the present political situation, though one of

much uncertainty, is most interesting. The disintegration of the Opposition, owing to the extravagances of those who maintain that Mr. Kruger has been in the right, and England in the wrong, in every step connected with South African affairs, though, as I have hinted, it may not last much longer, is a factor that seriously complicates the position of affairs. But, on the other hand, certain tendencies are already becoming visible on the Ministerial side which may have far-reaching consequences; and even those of us who do not pretend to the gift of prophecy must realise the fact that in party politics, as well as in our national history, we have entered upon a new era.

WEMYSS REID.

*The Editor of THE NINETEENTH CENTURY cannot undertake
to return unaccepted MSS.*

THE
~~UNCOMMONS~~
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
AND AFTER



No. CCXC—APRIL 1901

*OUR LAST EFFORT FOR A VOLUNTARY
 ARMY*

I

A CIVILIAN VIEW

AN ARMY WE MUST HAVE, IF WE ARE TO CONTINUE AN IMPERIAL POWER, OR EVEN EXIST AS AN INDEPENDENT NATION; AND IF THIS ARMY CANNOT BE OBTAINED BY VOLUNTARY MEANS, WE MUST RESORT TO CONSCRIPTION. (LORD ROBERTS, 'NINETEENTH CENTURY,' JUNE 1884.)

WHATEVER may be the final opinion of military experts upon Mr. Brodrick's scheme of Army Reorganisation, it cannot fail to strike everyone as an honest and courageous attempt, within limits which he believed to be binding, to grapple with the most pressing of our national problems. The country has waited patiently for the scheme because it was no doubt satisfied that the chief lessons of the South African war, which seemed so obvious to the 'man in the street,' were not likely to be lost upon the Government. Moreover,

it was recognised that Mr. Brodrick ought to be allowed time to feel his feet in his new office, especially as he showed every sign of conducting the campaign in South Africa with energy, and of tackling one administrative problem after another at home with unusual vigour. It was generally understood that great changes would be made in the Army, and at least as great changes at the War Office.

On the 8th of March Mr. Brodrick presented his scheme to the House of Commons in a speech remarkable for its frankness and courage. When he sat down no one could doubt that, whatever might be the value of his scheme, the country had a minister at the War Office who could be trusted to conceal no deficiencies, to shrink from no exposures, to spare no pains, no labour, no personal sacrifices, if thereby he might build up, to the best of his knowledge and ability, a satisfactory system of national defence. No doubt many people expected more heroic proposals. After the humiliations of last year the country was prepared to give more freely and to submit to greater sacrifices than at any previous period. All that was wanted was a plain word from a strong man. I believe there was an opportunity to put the defences of the Empire upon a solid and permanent footing, if there had been a statesman of commanding authority to take the tide at the flood. Outside the House of Commons the country was only waiting to be told what to do, and to do it. But to ask the country is one thing, and to ask the House of Commons is another, and so we get the scheme, which Mr. Brodrick no doubt considered touched the high-water mark of what was actually obtainable. It will be well to state as briefly and simply as possible what are the proposals contained in Mr. Brodrick's scheme.

It is based upon the principle that after we have made provision for our over-sea garrisons in India and elsewhere, we must be in a position at any moment to send abroad three fully equipped Army Corps and yet leave at home a sufficient organisation for our own protection.

In accordance with this principle Mr. Brodrick proposes to organise the home Army upon a new system. After making provision for over-sea garrisons, he establishes six Army Corps and assigns each to a separate district of the United Kingdom. Each Army Corps will be complete in itself with its proper complement of artillery and mounted troops, of stores and transport, all under its own Army Corps commander, who will be appointed for a period of three years only. The officers and, as far as possible, the staffs who command in time of peace will also command in time of war.

They will be Army Corps in fact as well as in name.

Three of the Army Corps with their headquarters at Aldershot, Salisbury Plain, and in Ireland respectively will consist entirely of regulars, and will always be kept in readiness for foreign service at a moment's notice.

The other three Army Corps with their headquarters at Colchester, York, and Edinburgh are to consist, both as to their infantry and their artillery, partly of regulars and partly of Militia and carefully selected Volunteers. Thus the Army Corps with its headquarters at Colchester will draw upon the best London Militia and Volunteer regiments; the Army Corps with its headquarters at York will draw upon the picked Militia and Volunteer battalions of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and so on. These three Army Corps will be reserved for home defence and will form the nucleus of the organisation for the protection of our shores.

Mr. Brodrick distinctly stated that in carrying out his scheme he was more concerned to increase the efficiency of our existing military forces and to perfect and complete their organisation than to add greatly to their numbers.

Coming to details he proposes to turn the existing regulars to more effective use by the simple process of freeing a certain number of battalions from garrison duty abroad and making them available for general purposes. This will be brought about (1) by enrolling eight special garrison battalions composed of veterans of more than fourteen years' service, whose whole duty it will be to garrison stations at present occupied by line battalions, (2) by raising five native Indian regiments for service in tropical stations outside India, (3) by transferring to the Navy certain of the smaller coaling-stations such as Colombo and Singapore, if the Admiralty will consent to take them over. By this means it is hoped to gain eighteen battalions of regulars for service elsewhere.

These eight garrison battalions are the only increase Mr. Brodrick proposes for the regular infantry. At the same time he hopes by certain improvements in the conditions of service to make the regular Army more popular, and recruiting easier.

In the next place he proposes to improve the pay and conditions of service of the Militia. The Militia only numbers 100,000 men. It ought to number 150,000. In order to raise it to this figure Mr. Brodrick proposes to abolish the present Militia Reserve for the Army and to establish a true Militia Reserve, consisting of: (1) Militiamen who have done ten years' service in the Militia; (2) Linesmen who have served fourteen years in the line and the reserve. The members of the Militia Reserve will only be liable for service in the United Kingdom. They will be paid a sort of retaining fee of fourpence a day. By this means it is hoped to raise 50,000 men.

The Yeomanry now number about 10,000 men. Mr. Brodrick proposes to increase this force to 35,000, and to call them Imperial Yeomanry. They will be armed with shortened rifles and with bayonets. They will train for eighteen days a year, of which fourteen will be obligatory. The pay of the men will be five shillings a day with rations and forage. Moreover, the sum of 5*l.* will be allowed to

every man who brings a horse, and mounts will be found for those who do not.

Of the Volunteers, twenty-five battalions and fifteen batteries of field artillery are to be specially trained for home defence as an integral part of the home army corps. The training and conditions of service of the Volunteers are to be generally improved.

The result of these changes is an effective addition to the Army as follows :

Additional number of Regulars	11,500
New Militia Reserve	50,000
Additional Yeomanry	25,000
Specially trained Volunteers	40,000
Total	126,500

This is to some extent misleading, however, because the 50,000 Militia and the 40,000 Volunteers are already supposed to exist in the army. The actual net addition asked for is, therefore, only 36,500 men. The other 90,000 are only additional in the sense that they are to be made effective.

The total number of men for the Army, which Mr. Brodrick asks Parliament to sanction, is made up as follows :—

Army at home	155,000
Reserve	90,000
Militia	100,000
New Militia Reserve	50,000
Imperial Yeomanry	35,000
Volunteers, say	250,000
Total	680,000

And these 680,000 men Mr. Brodrick apportions thus :—

Field Army	260,000
Garrisons at home	196,000
Volunteers for London defence	100,000
Various staffs	4,000
Recruits not fully trained, sick, &c. &c.	120,000
Total	680,000

To complete the outline of the scheme it must be added that Mr. Brodrick pledges himself to supply full equipment and stores for the whole of this force, to improve the artillery, to reform and reorganise the transport and the medical service, to improve the education and training of officers, and last, but not least, to reorganise the War Office itself.

Such is the task the Secretary of War has set himself to accomplish. It is a task from which any Minister might well shrink, but Mr. Brodrick approaches it with just those gifts of character which are most likely to carry him to success. Moreover he enjoys the immense advantage of having the cordial co-operation

of a Commander-in-Chief whose proved abilities, unrivalled experience, and never-to-be-forgotten services to the nation endow him with indisputable authority.

The present writer does not pretend to any qualifications whatever which would warrant him in criticising the purely military aspects of the scheme. That is the business of professional critics. But there are certain general observations which may be made with propriety by any civilian, who has carefully studied the question of national defence. One of these is that for the first time we see established for the military forces of the kingdom some such standard of strength as has been established for the Navy for several years. It is, of course, a rule accepted by both political parties that the Navy shall always be equal to the navies of any two Powers that could combine against us. Mr. Brodrick now lays it down that we shall always have three Army Corps immediately ready in every detail for foreign service without in any way trenching upon or disturbing our system of home defence. If this portion of the scheme is accepted by both political parties, and a standard of strength and efficiency is established, below which the Army will never be allowed to fall, a distinct step forward will have been taken, and a source of solid satisfaction will have been given to all Army reformers.

Another obvious remark is that the scheme proceeds upon the old lines of voluntary enlistment. We are to continue to appeal to the same class to come into the Army, only we are to offer slightly increased inducements. There is no broadening of the basis of our system of national defence. The old field is to be cultivated by a process of more 'intense' culture. There is no question of opening up fresh ground. This can only mean that the scheme is, after all, a stop-gap scheme. The military needs of the Empire must and will go on increasing. Nothing can prevent it. The cause does not lie with us. It lies in the change in the international situation. Ministers, to whichever party they belong, are as impotent to check the growth of armaments as to stop the growth of population or the passage of time. The suggestion that a conciliatory diplomacy can be any substitute for efficient armed forces is childish. It is the policy of the lamb towards the wolf in the fable, and everyone knows how powerless that was to avert the catastrophe. One must have had a House of Commons training to acquire so simple a faith in the power of the tongue. Our dangers and difficulties are far more likely to increase than to decrease. Our old isolation is as much a thing of the past as our sea-girt frontiers. The colonial activity of other European powers is giving us neighbours in every quarter of the globe, and their proximity brings with it the clash of interests and the possibilities of quarrel. It is not only that the expansion of our own Empire involves the expansion of our military force, but the expansion

of other peoples' empires also carries with it the same consequence. Even if we could limit the growth of our Empire, we should not necessarily limit the growth of our armaments; since we should still have to defend what we hold against constantly increasing odds. If we are slow to realise these facts ourselves, they are very clearly realised abroad. It is not only our hostile critics but those most friendly to us who compare unfavourably the enormous extent of our imperial responsibilities with the narrow basis of military organisation upon which they rest. I happened to be on the Continent when Mr. Brodrick presented his scheme to the House of Commons. I can bear witness to the favourable impression the obvious courage and sincerity of his speech created in quarters not usually too kindly disposed to British statesmanship, and certainly not sanguine of the efficiency and actuality of British Army reform. But politicians and publicists were practically unanimous in their verdict as to the inadequacy of the remedy for the disease, which the campaign in South Africa had made patent to the whole world, and in their conviction that the scheme itself was the last word—the swan-song, so to speak—of the purely voluntary system. And, indeed, Mr. Brodrick did not conceal from the House of Commons that this was also his conviction. In one of the most striking passages of his speech he said :

Is our Army in future for home defence to be a voluntary Army, or is it to be recruited by compulsion ? I am perfectly aware of the delicate ground upon which I am treading in respect to the question of voluntary and compulsory service. I know very well how easy it is in this House to win cheap cheers by a proud declaration about adhesion to the voluntary system. I think the voluntary system for home defence is not a thing to be proud of unless you get an efficient defence. . . . Therefore my adhesion to the voluntary system is strictly limited by our ability to obtain under it a force with which our military authorities can satisfy the Government that they have sufficient force to resist invasion and can maintain it to their satisfaction. At the same time the Government fully recognises that while the country is willing to pay heavily to escape compulsion, it is incumbent on the Government to exhaust every means before coming forward with any such proposals, and especially under the circumstances of the present time.

The 'circumstances' to which Mr. Brodrick refers in the concluding words of this passage are the readiness and enthusiasm with which thousands and thousands of volunteers have come forward to fight for the Empire at a moment of crisis. Many will think that these are also just the circumstances which offer a strong government a unique opportunity for making a great change. It is only when you touch the deeper springs of emotion in a people that you can prepare it for great national sacrifices. The opportunity has for the moment been missed, and one can only wait patiently, and hope that when it recurs the sacrifices asked will not be still heavier. While it is possible that in the present state—I will not say of public opinion, but of parliamentary opinion, the government of the day is bound to exhaust every other means before coming forward

with a proposal to abandon the purely voluntary system, no such obligation is laid upon writers, who are not hampered by the exigencies of political parties, and are concerned only for the fortunes of their country. It is their clear duty to prepare the way by every means in their power for the change which is surely coming to us, as it has already come to each of the other great European communities, I mean the change from a wholly mercenary to a largely national Army.

In approaching this question I am aware how unlike our circumstances are to the circumstances of our Continental neighbours, how different our needs, our obligations, and our dangers are from theirs. I do not overlook the fact that, whereas they have for the most part to defend compact territories, we have to defend widely scattered possessions; that, while the vast majority of their land forces must always serve at home, a very large proportion of ours, even in times of peace, must serve abroad. Nor do I forget that in our case naval forces, and in theirs land forces, are the predominant element in schemes of national defence. But all these differences seem to me arguments not against the principle or basis upon which we in England should build up our military system, but solely against any wholesale imitation of the details of Continental systems. There is no similarity, it is true, between our respective circumstances, but there is absolute likeness in the magnitude of our responsibilities and dangers. They have been driven by menace to their national existence to base their military systems upon the training in arms of their whole male population. The details they have worked out according to their individual requirements. We are, I believe, being driven in exactly the same direction, but we are absolutely free to settle our own details according to our own needs.

No doubt we are being impelled mainly by the rapid growth of our imperial responsibilities and the acknowledged difficulty of meeting sudden dangers abroad and at home with an army recruited solely by voluntary enlistment. I doubt if we realise how much we are also influenced by the pressure of European public opinion. When all European armies were mercenary armies we were all on the same footing, but now that it has ceased to be the practice among the majority of civilised peoples to entrust the defence of their country to paid servants, the obligation of personal service in defence of the fatherland is becoming an obligation every man feels it a duty to fulfil and no man desires to avoid. In our own time a great change has come over public feeling with regard to this question in Continental countries. Time was when young men sought to evade the duty of military service, when they preferred to cross the sea to England and America, even if such flight involved perpetual banishment. But gradually such evasions have become rarer and rarer. To-day they are condemned by public opinion and are of comparatively

infrequent occurrence. A couple of generations have sufficed to remove the grievance and to accustom the minds of young citizens to look upon military service as one of the duties of life, which is performed quietly, naturally, and without heroics. One of the consequences of this change is that our neighbours are beginning to despise us for delegating the defence of our Empire to what they regard as mercenary troops. I do not think we realise how deep this feeling is in their minds. We think their dislike of us is entirely due to envy. I fear there is in it a considerable element of contempt. And the greater our prosperity, the more splendid the Empire becomes, the stronger is this feeling on their part, that our power is maintained and defended not by the personal service and personal sacrifice of each individual citizen, but by a people which sits at home and pays others to fight for it. The picture is no doubt distorted, but it is salutary at times to see ourselves as others see us.

There can be little doubt that a good deal of the prejudice which exists amongst us against compulsory military service is due to misconceptions and to well-worn traditions with regard to the imaginary horrors and ruinous consequences of conscription. Within the limits of a short article it is obviously impossible to deal fully with so large a question, but one or two points may be touched upon. There is no serious reason, military or other, why compulsory military training in this kingdom should conform to the Continental type. There is indeed every reason in our national character and in our actual military requirements why it should not. One of the most objectionable features in the foreign system is barrack life, but why should that be essential to effective military training? It might just as well have been urged as an argument against compulsory education that you would be obliged to send every child in the land away from home to a boarding-school. It is perfectly feasible to establish a system which will not withdraw lads from their own localities at all, but will be carried on over a series of years, very much as our elementary education is carried on in the earlier years of life, with the least possible disturbance to local and home life. I am speaking of course of military training and not of military service.

Another well-known objection is the 'deplorable economic waste' of withdrawing young men from the pursuit of industries during the period of their military training. Again I say we need not and probably should not adopt the Continental plan. With our shortened hours of labour there is plenty of time in the life of a youth for the acquisition of useful military instruction without any very serious interruption to the industries of the nation. We have an idea in this country that it is rather clever of us to have the whole of our male population uninterruptedly engaged in the production of wealth, while our neighbours have to take a couple of years out of the life of each of

their able-bodied sons. There is a dangerous similarity between this view and that which has permitted our children to leave school at an earlier age than the children of any other enlightened people. The true strength of a nation lies not in its wealth, but in the health, vigour, and discipline of its people. Those of us who, like the present writer, employ large numbers of men on the Continent as well as in our own country cannot fail to form a favourable opinion of the excellent effect military training has had upon the bearing and physique of Continental populations. We talk of the economic waste of this system, and yet the country in which it is most strictly enforced is the very country which has increased most rapidly in wealth and has become our most formidable industrial rival. I mean of course Germany. The military delegate of Germany to the Peace Conference at the Hague not only refused to admit that military service was an economic burden to his country, but declared that its educational and disciplinary value were among the principal causes of Germany's industrial progress and success, and in this he is confirmed by many English observers. Germany has, I believe, succeeded in making her Army not only what it of course primarily should be, a perfect instrument of national defence, but also a great school of physical training and moral discipline. When one reflects upon the absolute neglect of physical training among vast masses of our own population, crowded together in large towns, dependent for bodily exercise upon chance games, which very few of them know how to play, one is inclined to wonder whether compulsory military training will not one day be demanded in the interest of public health and national well-being, even if it is not resorted to for purposes of national defence. We are in a position where not to go forward is to go back. In war as in trade we are continuing to pit our haphazard system against the carefully reasoned and elaborately organised systems of other peoples.

Coming back to the purely military problem, it is in our case undoubtedly a peculiar one. Our Army for foreign service must always be a voluntary Army. None would dream of maintaining the contrary. We are a fighting race, and the spirit of our people is sufficiently martial and adventurous to supply an adequate number of recruits for active service in ordinary times. It is at moments of crisis that the weakness of our system becomes apparent, that it betrays the narrowness of the basis upon which it rests. What we need is to widen that basis, to call gradually into existence a nation trained to arms, upon which we can rely entirely for home defence, and to which we can appeal confidently for any number of volunteers for foreign service. It is rather universal military training than universal military service that we require.

We saw how splendid was the response last year to the call for volunteers for South Africa. Can we doubt that it would have been

far larger even than it was, if it had been addressed to a people already used and trained to arms?

Of course the adoption of universal military training would not solve our military problems. It would only provide an abundance of raw material from which to build up adequately the defences of the Empire. It is just this abundance of raw material that the increasing needs and responsibilities of the Empire demand, and which we have by some means or other to find, if we are, in the words of Lord Roberts, 'to continue as an Imperial Power, or even exist as an independent nation.' The problem that confronts Germany and France is the exact reverse of our own. They have secured and trained their men, but have still to organise an effective system for foreign expeditions and over-sea requirements. We have a fairly satisfactory system for foreign service, but have now to organise a vast reserve of men.

Sooner or later our statesmen must ask the British people to become imperial in fact as well as in name, to take upon themselves the duty and the privilege of personal military service in defence of the Empire of which they are so justly proud. Other peoples have been asked to give this supreme pledge of citizenship after great military disasters. We are allowed an opportunity of setting our house in order before the evil days come upon us.

HENRY BIRCHENOUGH,

OUR LAST EFFORT FOR A VOLUNTARY ARMY

II

A MILITARY VIEW

Who would have imagined ten years ago, five years ago, or even two years ago that Army Reorganisation would have been the question of the hour? Those who can remember for many successive years the deserted appearance of the House of Commons when the Army Estimates were introduced, the listless discussion, and the indifference of the occupants of both front benches, may now well rub their eyes. In fact, so great was the apathy and want of interest shown by the executive officials of existing, late, or prospective Governments that it was a most rare occurrence for any to be present on such occasions, unless they chanced to be at the time or had been very recently in employment at the War Office. Even under such circumstances their attendance was intermittent and to all appearances their attention most distracted. In this manner were millions of public money voted away, the great object of the Minister in charge of the vote being to get it through, if possible without discussion, and as quickly as could be managed. So the ancient coach went lumbering on until at last came the rude awakening so long predicted; an unexpected storm came, and then it was found that the old-fashioned team was not strong enough to draw the antiquated machine up the hill in times of tempest, emergency and danger; hence we must have a newly fashioned coach and a much more serviceable team.

In proceeding to consider the new scheme of army reorganisation, as unfolded by Mr. Brodrick in a statement of most remarkable clearness and power, the first question which occurs to any critic is, can you get the men? The recruiting difficulty is at the bottom of all our Army troubles and embarrassments; it is the principal cause of our great expenditure in proportion to results, as compared with foreign armies. It hampers our Army training, it impairs our efficiency, it imposes endless trammels on the hands of our officials connected with Army administration, be they military or civilian; in short, it is the one difficulty which we have to solve, and until solved

all so-called schemes of Army reform must be in the future, as they have been in the past, snares and delusions.

Time and experience can only show whether the remedies suggested and foreshadowed by Mr. Brodrick will prove effective, whether they will materially assist the Inspector-General of Recruiting, and whether his annual report, say for the year 1902, will be less melancholy, less alarming, than those for the years 1897, 1898, that is, before the present war fever and wave of military enthusiasm had affected the youth of the Empire.

On one point no impartial person, whatever private opinion he may have regarding the advantages or drawbacks of compulsory service, can fail to concur with Mr. Brodrick that, at all events, its introduction into our military system at the present time would be not only premature but, I believe, also impossible. Just at a time when voluntary effort had produced such striking results, when there had been so much personal sacrifice and so much devotion, any introduction of the compulsory element would have been most ungrateful, most inopportune, and would to a certainty have been badly received by the country. We are not ready for it yet, but that, it will come and must come sooner or later in some shape or form there can scarcely be any reasonable doubt. Let us only trust that it may not be introduced as the result of a great national and crushing disaster, that we may not need the humiliation and lesson of a Jena, a Königgrätz, or a Sedan before realising our weakness or facing our necessities. Politics, vote-catching, unfortunately play in this country such a large part in all our proposed changes and reforms, that ministries have to study the tactics of their adversaries, and to consider what may be used as a party cry; hence, as a rule, when adopting any policy they select the line of least resistance, the one which, in the first instance, will occasion least outcry and excite least opposition. This principle has recently been especially illustrated by the Budget proposals; whether one class is over-taxed and another under-taxed has been but little regarded, but the voting power of each portion of the community has been most carefully gauged. So it is and must be in the case of army reforms. As long as we have the present system of government by party, conscription or compulsion would form an invaluable cry for the Radical party, although in all social matters compulsory powers, compulsory acquisition of land, compulsion in the many varied incidents of municipal and local government form the principal planks of their political platform. It is notoriously unwise to hazard a prophecy, but it would seem tolerably clear that, if any form of compulsory service for the Army is ever to be proposed and carried with the practically unanimous assent of the nation, it must be initiated by a Radical government, who, in such cases of national emergency, can rely on the loyal support of a

Unionist Opposition. It is true that the present leader has joined with the ex-leader of the Liberal party within the last few days in denouncing any form of compulsion in most uncompromising terms, but we have seen changes of opinion before among all classes of politicians. Such a change as this would not be the most complete or remarkable on record. On one point alone all must agree: that for a country like this, with an Army having so many and varied duties in all parts of the world, any form of conscription, no matter how modified, is beset with every sort of difficulty, and should only be suggested as a very last resort, when all other means of enlistment have been tried and have failed.

When we come to consider Mr. Brodrick's proposals for stimulating enlistment nothing but commendation can be given, so far as they go. It has always been recognised that, in order to attract the best class of men to the Army, no pains should be spared to increase their comfort and improve their condition. The unnecessary guard and sentry duties, as Mr. Brodrick says, have a paralysing influence on military life. I venture to say that certainly half of these might be abolished without detriment to the service, and much to the benefit of both the comfort and training of the soldier. How often have we not seen an armed sentry marching up and down in an aimless way at his post, the posting of this sentry, with his reliefs, involving the similar abstraction from useful training and instruction of three other men, when the presence of an unarmed orderly would have been equally useful and far more convenient both to the soldier and to the service! Similarly, improved accommodation in barracks is of the greatest importance, if we wish to attract and retain in our army recruits from the superior classes of the population. It would seem moreover that Mr. Brodrick is perfectly right when he says that a higher rate of pay for the lower ranks would fail to have any perceptible influence on the recruiting market, while it would add enormously to the expenditure. It has been calculated that every recruit now when he joins can count on putting weekly into his pocket at least four shillings after having been provided with food, lodging, clothes, and medical attendance. As soon as he attains nineteen years of age he gets free rations, which adds 3*d.* a day to his pay, and I should like to know where in civil life can untrained labour of a lad of say eighteen or nineteen obtain as much? There is, however, an increase in pay which apparently Mr. Brodrick does not contemplate and which I believe is much needed and would produce excellent results—that is, in the non-commissioned ranks. It would also seem but fair that those 'specially' enlisted recruits, who do not come up to the physical standard of efficient soldiers, should receive a lower rate while in that embryo condition. The saving under one head might well go to cover the expense of the increased pay under the other.

When speaking of giving the young soldier increased facilities

for instruction and training, there is one reform, often advocated, to which no allusion is made. I refer to the employment of reserve men to perform permanent regimental and garrison duties, which in no way add to a soldier's efficiency, and take him away from his military duties. Not only would such a reform be a great boon to men who have served their time with the colours, and very likely, being ignorant of a trade, find difficulty in obtaining civilian employment, but it would also be an inexpensive means of adding to the efficiency of our home battalions, which too frequently are depleted of the greater proportion of their best trained and best instructed men in order to find orderlies, servants to regimental and staff officers, clerks, and such like duties, which would be equally well, if not even better, carried out by older and more experienced men. The 6*d.* a day paid to each reserve man, supplemented with free rations, lodgings, and say another 8*d.* a day, would be sufficient emolument to retain a large number of excellent men for the performance of these necessary routine duties.

There is also another point, to which Mr. Brodrick in his statement has made no reference, and which I believe is of more importance than almost any other, if we desire to maintain a voluntary army, and to attract the best class of men to its ranks. I allude to the extension of the principle that all soldiers of good character and education should have assured to them suitable employment under Government at the termination of their service. In the reports of the Inspector-General of Recruiting on several occasions complaints have been made of the disinclination on the part of many Government departments to engage discharged soldiers, no matter how fully qualified they may be for employment. Space would fail me were I to attempt here to gibbet the various offices and officials who are the chief offenders. Suffice it to say there are many on the list who ought to know better. It is well known that not only the present but also the late Secretary of State for War did their very utmost in this direction, and that in many quarters they have encountered most uncompromising opposition. It would have been satisfactory to know that this antagonism would cease in the future and that there was some chance of our following the example of Germany and other Continental nations, where a large number of Government posts are reserved for deserving non-commissioned officers, who alone are qualified for them, and who can look forward to enjoying them as a right and a fitting reward for good and meritorious service.

When we come to consider the broader principles of Mr. Brodrick's scheme, although I fear there are many details which are open to criticism, on the whole it would seem they deserve warm commendation. The addition to the regular forces of 11,500 men is undoubtedly needed. The abolition of the former so-called Militia Reserve

and the formation of a new and real reserve of 50,000 men for that service is a wise step, to which, so far as I know, no exception can be taken, of course provided that the men can be obtained. The same proviso applies to the addition to the strength of the Yeomanry, and in this instance I fear that the necessity of having a smart and attractive uniform, on which so much stress was laid in connection with the Regular Army, has been entirely overlooked and is equally important. The fascination of a khaki suit, especially when it becomes soiled and dirty, will, I fear, be scarcely found sufficient to attract those smart young men, who hitherto have been the object of admiration in their county town when arrayed in all the glory of a becoming cavalry uniform.

Then again as regards the Volunteers and the estimated addition of 40,000 more trained men, this subject is also beset with difficulties. It remains to be seen whether men will be able to spare the time, or employers will be able to grant them the leave from their work, which alone can enable them to obtain that additional training which is contemplated. Time, however, can alone show whether this part of the scheme is to prove the failure which unfriendly critics have predicted for it. There is one reform which it would seem might have been introduced with great advantage, and that is raising the standard of the physical requirements of Volunteers. If any one chooses to scrutinise even one of the best Metropolitan Volunteer Corps as they march through the streets, he cannot fail to be struck by the extreme youth, and hence physical immaturity, of a large proportion of those in the ranks. It is well known that the same is the rule, not the exception, among a large proportion of the rank and file of all Volunteer Corps throughout the country. It would be most interesting to ascertain how many of the nominal 250,000 Volunteers, now enrolled in this country, come up to the very modest physical standard exacted of all recruits before they are accepted for the Regular Army. I maintain that all those men who do not reach this standard should not appear on the roll of efficient Volunteers, otherwise they are a delusion and a sham. It would be a pity to check the martial ardour of the youth of this country; it would be equally unfortunate to take any step which would tend to deprive boys of the excellent training and discipline imparted to them in the Volunteer ranks. The formation of Cadet Corps would appear to be the best solution of this difficulty, or, in cases where the numbers are not sufficient to form a separate corps, let the boys who wish to join the Volunteers be borne supernumerary to the establishment; and even, if it is deemed advisable that they should help to swell the capitation grant, let them not be classed as efficient soldiers or delude the country by being made to swell its nominal defensive strength.

There are so many points in the new organisation scheme which

invite comment, if not criticism, that it would be impossible to dwell on all in the limits of a Review article; I must therefore content ourselves by referring only to some of the most salient and leading features. Undoubtedly the most striking and novel departure from the old system is the formation of six Army Corps, three of which are presumed to be at any time available for service abroad. There is a boldness and originality about such a proposal which is calculated to fascinate the imagination, more especially of those who have not had personal experience of the danger of adopting foreign models for an army whose service and method of enlistment are entirely different from those of all Continental armies. This Army Corps proposal naturally evoked much criticism from Sir William Vernon Harcourt and his successor in the leadership of the Liberal party. Their remarks, however, would have had more value had they, just for once only, abstained from discussing a subject of such national importance in a purely partisan spirit.

It is no doubt much to be lamented that our normal military expenditure should have risen in so few years from 18 to 29 millions, and that our Naval Estimates should have increased in as great if not even greater proportion; but, as pointed out by Mr. Balfour, this is the fault not of ourselves but of our neighbours. The British taxpayer, however, much as he may grumble, does not grudge the money, provided he gets his money's worth. I do not believe that the standard laid down by Mr. Brodrick of our military requirements will be regarded as excessive, but it is indeed a question whether the Army Corps organisation is suited to our insular position. No doubt it will facilitate the decentralisation so much needed, and if, as designed, it will result in the formation of an efficient staff, ready on an emergency to take up their duties in war with the same units with which they have been in the habit of acting in peace, the advantage gained will be enormous. It must, however, be remarked that the system will be an expensive one, a very large staff will be required, much more numerous than in the old command arrangement, and the occasions when an entire Army Corps will have to leave our shores will, it is to be hoped, be most rare and exceptional.

There is, however, one grave omission from this scheme, this Army Corps system, an omission to which, so far as I am aware, no hostile critic has hitherto invited attention. I allude to the creation of a compact force of, say, 20,000 or, better still, 40,000 men, ready at any moment for service abroad without having recourse to mobilisation. According to the present proposals, the various Army Corps will be composed, as regards Regulars, solely of the 'squeezed lemon' battalions of which we have in recent years heard so much. They will be the depôts, feeders, and training schools for the service battalions in India and South Africa, and could not be sent abroad until they had been mobilised.

Circumstances have frequently risen, and, it may be safely predicted, will again recur, which make it highly desirable to strengthen the garrisons in some parts of our vast empire as a precautionary measure to avoid war, not to provoke it. Mobilisation is essentially an alarming measure, which cannot be adopted without full publicity and various formalities; foreign Powers never have recourse to it, unless war is regarded as almost imminent or unavoidable. When the situation gives cause for anxiety, but there are hopes that peace may be maintained, such action on the part of any Government, as mobilisation, would almost inevitably embarrass the diplomatic action, and would not meet with the approval of the public at home, without whose approval or sanction it could not be effected. There could not be a better illustration of this than what occurred in 1899 as regards South Africa. It was most desirable, nay even essential, strongly to reinforce our garrison in South Africa as a precautionary measure, to protect our colonies from invasion. The Government were fully alive to this urgent necessity, which it now appears was brought strongly before them in the month of June that year by Lord Wolsley, who recommended them to mobilise an Army Corps on Salisbury Plain. As negotiations with Kruger were still proceeding, and public opinion at home was not ripe for such action, the Government did not dare to follow his advice, and without mobilisation they had no troops fit to send unless they drew a limited force from the Indian garrison, as was afterwards done.

It is idle now to surmise what might have been the result had it been possible to despatch to South Africa, in June or July 1899, 40,000, 30,000, or even 20,000 men, so that all the important strategic points might have been occupied in good time, before the grass had begun to grow or the Dutch Republics were ready to move. It may, however, be safely said that the war would long since have been over, many thousands of gallant men now in their graves would still be alive, and 50 or 60 millions of money would have been saved. It is most earnestly to be hoped that, before the scheme now propounded has been matured and passed, some provision may be made for repairing this most serious flaw in our complicated and justly abused military system.

It now only remains for us to allude to some subsidiary points in Mr. Brodrick's reforms. His proposal to withdraw service battalions from the various colonial fortresses and to replace them by garrison battalions, to be composed of long-service men, is undoubtedly a step which would conduce much to the efficiency of our fighting army. It is, however, open to very serious objections, which have already been pointed out by various critics both in the Press and in Parliament. Any resumption of the long-service system is not unnaturally regarded with great disfavour, as being expensive as regards pensions and likely to cause deterioration in those to whom it is applied,

especially when their duties are limited to the dull routine of not very healthy garrisons. Doubts are expressed whether either the men or the officers required for these battalions will be procurable in sufficient quantity or quality to make the scheme workable. I confess that I see but little ground for these various objections ; on the contrary I believe the proposals to be sound and practical, although, as in the case of various other suggested improvements, time can alone show if they will turn out a real success.

When speaking of colonial fortresses it certainly appears a subject for regret that, as would appear from the statement made on the introduction of the Navy Estimates in the House of Commons, the Admiralty should not see their way to fall in with Mr. Brodrick's suggestion and take over the minor coaling stations. From a military point of view, both as regards efficiency and expense, there can be only one opinion regarding the great advantage of such a step, 5,000 men would be set free for the active Army ; it is admitted on all sides that the maintenance of these garrisons is wholly incompatible with the conditions of short service and efficiency in the field ; while as regards expenditure there would be a saving in the maintenance of an unnecessary military staff and transport of troops. It appears, however, from letters which have recently appeared in the *Times* and elsewhere, that not only the Admiralty but also some distinguished Naval officers regard with disfavour this proposed reform. Opinion, however, is by no means unanimous ; Sir John Colomb, himself an old Marine Artilleryman, has for years past advocated such a change in the House of Commons from a Naval point of view, and has been supported by many other members who have made Imperial defence their special study. The arguments in favour are shortly as follows. The admiral on the station would obtain the entire control of the coaling stations, which are only maintained for the use of his fleet, while the present divided responsibility between the military and naval authorities, and consequent friction, would be avoided. It would be an advantage for the Navy to have a reserve of men available on shore, which at any time they could utilise in case of emergency. It would benefit the garrisons occasionally to take them for a cruise at sea, and it might not be unpleasant for the Marines on board ship to have the rest and change of a 'cruise on shore.' The whole question hinges on whether the 5,000 additional Marines and Marine Artillery could be raised without much trouble. This point can only be settled after careful and painstaking investigation.

One word in conclusion regarding one of the minor details of Mr. Brodrick's scheme ; we call it a minor detail, but it is, we are convinced, one of the greatest importance. Nothing could be more short-sighted or ill-judged than to enact vexatious sumptuary laws difficult to enforce, not difficult to evade, but which would have the effect of discouraging the best class of young men in the country

from entering the commissioned ranks of the Army. We do not wish to alter the present class of officer or to prevent 'a rich man spending his money,' but what we do wish is to attract more of the present class into the Army, to make it possible for the poor but well-educated gentleman to serve alongside his wealthier comrade on terms of perfect equality and comfort.

This war has shown, if nothing else, that our 'gilded youth' have not yet been enervated by the luxury which demoralised the Roman aristocracy, and which contributed more than any other cause to the decay and fall of that mighty Empire. It has, however, been a disgrace and a scandal, as acknowledged by Mr. Wyndham in the House of Commons, that so large private means have been necessary for officers to exist in the Army, more especially in cavalry regiments. Mr. Brodrick announces that he is about to take one important step to reduce the initial outlay and annual necessary expenses, that is in cheapening uniforms. British uniforms have been notoriously for many years past not only the most impractical but also the most expensive in Europe, nor has there been any counterbalancing advantage as regards attractiveness. Whereas expensive gold lace has been lavishly plastered over all sorts of uniform and has been subject to continual minor alterations in detail, all involving expense, variety of colours, so well utilised in other armies, has been entirely disregarded. In fact the British officer has hitherto been at the mercy of a ring of Army tailors, who have charged most exorbitant prices for a most unsuitable dress, modelled, altered, and re-altered from the most expensive patterns that War Office and other ingenuity could devise. It is satisfactory to know that all this is now to be changed, and that officers are to have not only a working, but also a show uniform, at reasonable rates.

So far satisfactory as the reforms are regarding uniform, it is to be regretted that they were not further extended to the matter of horses. Cavalry officers have hitherto been at the mercy of a ring of horse dealers, just as they have been fleeced by the Army tailors. 200*l.* or 150*l.* apiece is not an unusual price for a young officer to pay for young and unbroken chargers on joining a cavalry regiment; these also have often to be replaced within a year or so at not dissimilar prices. Government insists on mounted officers having horses, whether they belong to cavalry or infantry; under these circumstances it is only fair that it should provide at least one animal free of cost, and others at a reasonable market rate, as is done by all foreign Governments. Such a much-needed concession would, however, necessitate the formation of remount depôts for the reception and preliminary training of young horses, one of those reforms most urgently required to promote the efficiency of our mounted services.

It seems needless to add, in closing these remarks, that, no matter how excellent may be any scheme of Army reorganisation, it is

bound to prove a failure unless the machinery for working the entire fabric is well devised and can move smoothly and harmoniously. It has been recently shown only too plainly that this harmonious and combined action has long been absent from our War Office. One system after another has been tried, and all successively have been found almost equally unworkable. It is therefore satisfactory to learn that Mr. Brodrick has himself suggested modifications of the 1895 Order in Council, which even in the opinion of a most severe critic of that system, Lord Wolseley, would meet, at all events as a temporary measure, the circumstances of the case. I think all will admit, whatever view they may take of the recent debates in the House of Lords on the position of the Commander-in-Chief, that the discussion was of the most painful character. We need not, however, regret it if in any way it tends to place our War Office on a businesslike and practical footing.

To achieve this end it seems unnecessary to copy Continental models, but let us content ourselves, as recently advocated in the *Times*, with the example shown us by our military organisation in India. I am sure that no one who has served both at home and in the East can fail to have been much impressed by the difference as regards efficiency between the two armies—in fact it seems hard at first to realise that they both belong to the same country. Having had some opportunity of studying Continental military systems, I think I may say that our Army in India, as regards immediate preparedness for war, is superior to that of any other country, except perhaps Germany. Why, therefore, should we not adapt our Eastern methods to this country, more especially as our present Commander-in-Chief, to whom more than any other our Indian Army owes its efficiency, can give us the benefit of his unrivalled experience?

It appears that the organisation might be somewhat as follows. The Secretary of State would be supreme like the Viceroy. Under him there would be two great military officials: one the Commander-in-Chief, responsible for the inspection, training, discipline, and patronage of the Army; the other charged with the supply, transport, clothing, ordnance, and fortification. Of course there would be the subordinate heads of departments, as at present; but above all let these various chiefs be allowed to spend the money allotted to their special branch without immediate interference, in all matters of detail, from the civilian side of the War Office. It is needless to add that there would have to be a financial clerk attached to each department, and also the final audit by the Accountant-General as a wholesome and necessary check on expenditure. It would seem that in this way much unnecessary labour might be saved, friction avoided, and procedure greatly expedited.

There is another point, to which, I am glad to see, attention has been called by several critics in the press. It has been shown quite

clearly by recent events and disclosures that it is not sufficient merely to collect information ; it is also necessary to digest it and profit by it. No official with many administrative duties to perform has the leisure to draw up elaborate and detailed schemes of military operations. This duty, in other great armies, is performed by the General Staff Department, which does not exist in this country, and which, I hold, should be at once created, the so-called Intelligence branch being merged in it.

Similarly as regards the training and selection of staff officers, these duties have hitherto not been carried out on a definite and methodical principle in our Army ; one officer may be an excellent draughtsman or first-rate in an office, but may hate the sight of a horse and be perfectly useless in the field ; another may be excellent in a subordinate position, but may lack the nerve, backbone so to speak, and determination which would fit him for a post of responsibility. It is detrimental to the interests of the Service and unfair to the officer himself to reject him entirely because in, say, a round hole he may prove to be a square peg. Personal knowledge of the individual can alone decide the position which he will fill with most credit and advantage ; hitherto there has been no official in the British Service who has been afforded this opportunity of observation, or to whom the responsibility has been deputed of making these important selections.

It now only remains to express a hope that friction at headquarters may be a thing of the past, that Mr. Brodrick may be as successful as he is known to be sincere and energetic, and that the luminous and able manner in which he introduced his scheme to the House of Commons and the country may be a good augury of the reputation which he will bequeath to posterity as a great War Minister.

FRANK S. RUSSELL,
Major-General.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR ARMY REFORM

I

MILITARY TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR LADS

THE scheme of Army reform and reorganisation which Mr. Brodrick has submitted to Parliament as the outcome of his unremitting labours during the winter consists largely of matter which it is best to leave to be dealt with by intellects specially trained and fitted to handle it. Professional opinion and experience must deservedly weigh more with the Secretary of State than the theories of those whom Mr. Balfour has spoken of good-humouredly as 'amateur strategists.' Nevertheless there is one point—the vital point upon which the success of the new scheme hinges—whereon a mere civilian may feel entitled to express his views, and may possibly contribute some suggestion not altogether devoid of practical value.

The point referred to as vital to the prospects of Mr. Brodrick's scheme is the future supply of recruits. 'We have never,' said the Secretary of State in a speech equally remarkable for frankness and lucidity, 'we have never had such recruiting as we had last year under the influence of the warlike spirit that pervaded the country. . . . That spirit brought us the largest number of recruits to the Army in any year in any period of our history.'

Many an anxious glance upon the future must Mr. Brodrick and Lord Roberts have cast in regard to this crucial point. They have refrained, and most wisely refrained, from proposing anything of the nature of conscription. It has fallen out of the recollection of most people, I think, that on one occasion in the last century Parliament did decree conscription, or what was tantamount to conscription. In 1803, when Napoleon held 120,000 men at Boulogne ready for the invasion of Great Britain, Mr. Addington's Government carried through both Houses, without a single division on the principle, a Bill calling to arms and providing for the training of every male subject between the ages of seventeen and fifty-five. This Act for a levy *en masse* was never put into force, because such was the patriotic spirit at that time that when Parliament reassembled in 1804 there was a Volunteer force already enrolled and armed of no fewer than 379,943 officers and men. The nation of shopkeepers

had shown itself, as has always been the case, quite ready to keep the shop.

These figures appear the more remarkable when it is remembered that in 1803 the total population of Great Britain and Ireland scarcely exceeded 15 millions. The experience of the last two years shows that long years of peace have not availed to damp the military spirit of our people. Were a similar emergency to that of 1803 to recur in 1903, it would be safe to assume that the proportion of the population ready to fly to arms would be no whit less than it was 100 years ago, and that our present population of upwards of 40 millions would produce nothing short of one million Volunteers.

But that, of course, is not what is wanted. It may go far to reassure us against the possibility of successful invasion, but it does little or nothing to guarantee the success of Mr. Brodrick's scheme. Our Imperial liabilities render it indispensable that we should not only have enough military force to protect our own shores, but that we should be in a position to put an adequate force in the field, complete in every respect, in any part of the world and at short notice, without denuding ourselves of security at home. Not only have we no warrant for expecting anything at the close of the present war except a marked reaction which will seriously diminish the flow of recruits, but we should be imbecile if we founded our calculations upon anything else. *Redde mihi, Vare, legiones!* will assuredly be the sigh of the Secretary of State for War and the Commander-in-Chief in a few years, unless in the meantime some provision can be devised to render the Army a more attractive form of employment.

Is it impossible to make any provision towards ensuring the success of Mr. Brodrick's magnificent scheme? There is abundant material. As we have seen lately, the right spirit is latent in that material, and blazes up on occasion; can nothing be done towards maintaining and utilising a steady flame? Can it be said that we have ever made a serious attempt to attract or direct young men into the ranks of the Army? And is it beyond the ingenuity of man to divert into a permanent channel some part at least of that fluctuating volume of casual labour and chronic loafing which hangs upon the flanks of the great industrial army?

I am bold enough to ask consideration of certain proposals which have been submitted to me by an officer at present serving at the front. Captain Maitland was invalided home last year; he spent his sick leave in formulating certain propositions, which, on his being ordered out again to rejoin his regiment, he handed to me to bring under the attention of the proper authorities. I hope it may be understood most distinctly that whatever merit the scheme may be found ultimately to contain will reflect no credit whatever upon the writer of this paper, although he has great faith in its efficacy towards solving a very obscure problem.

I must confess that I am under the disadvantage of not having been able to obtain the advice of the highest professional authority on recruiting. When Captain Maitland left his papers in my hands I wrote, after examining them, to the Inspector-General of Recruiting at the War Office, requesting an interview. He replied that Captain Maitland had already explained the outlines of his scheme to him; that 'the idea was not altogether new'; that he (the Inspector-General) did not consider the scheme a workable one, and declined to make an appointment with me.

Now I know the value of time too well to be in the habit of wasting that of other people. I had hoped that upwards of twenty years in Parliament and six years in a public Department might have served as warrant that such was not my intention. But General Borrett evidently thought otherwise. Perhaps he was seized with the hopelessness of expecting any valuable suggestion on military matters from a mere civilian, forgetting, possibly, that it is among civilians alone that recruiting must be carried on. Be that as it may, I am conscious of the disadvantage of placing Captain Maitland's proposals before the public without having any criticism or opinion upon them from the Inspector-General except that they are unworkable. That was the verdict pronounced by his critics upon Jourdan when he laid his scheme of conscription before the French Assembly, yet what a mighty engine of offence and defence it was to prove in years to come!

Captain Maitland's proposals briefly are as follows. There shall be established in the various regimental districts, and under control of the district commandants, training schools for the reception of lads of fifteen or sixteen. That is the critical period in the youth of the working classes; the statutory school age has been passed, and a very large percentage of lads drift out into the world, acquire the habit of loafing, and too often go to swell the ranks of Hooliganism. Such of these lads as can be persuaded to enter the district training schools—King Edward's Schools, as Captain Maitland suggests they shall be called—will be instructed there for two years in athletics, riding, cycling, elementary drill, musketry, scouting, and signalling. Military history may also be taught, and habits of discipline and cleanliness will be acquired. Then, after two years' training, the lads will be drafted either into the district regiment of infantry, or into such other branch of the Service as they may have set their hearts upon. They will enter their battalions not as the raw article, with everything to be drummed into it, but mentally and physically prepared to learn the duties of soldiers, of which they have already mastered the rudiments.

The advantages of such preparation will be best appreciated by those who understand what a strain recruit drill throws upon the resources of a battalion. It is not likely that anybody will seriously

question the merits of shortening the period between enlistment and the dismissal from recruit drill. It would not only lighten the work of instructors, but it would increase the number of men for duties, thus lightening the burden all round. But those advantages are small ones compared with the gain to the recruit himself. There is too much foundation for the distrust and dislike of the Army as a profession which prevail, with almost unvarying monotony in the classes whence the rank and file are drawn, from Land's End to John o' Groat's. It is true that there is less foundation than there was in the old flogging days for the Duke of Wellington's too celebrated dictum that British soldiers were the scum of the earth and that they enlisted for drink, and for drink alone. It is a pity that the Duke's almost intemperate zeal for the truth induced him to pronounce that sentence; still more so that it should have received currency through the pen of that enthusiastic, but not always discreet interviewer, Lord Mahon. It has been repeated from lip to lip, and has been echoed down to our day. It is time that an attempt were made to obliterate it.

When the scheme of these King Edward's Schools was submitted to one of our most energetic and best known bishops, he remarked: 'Parents of boys likely to do well are afraid of the Army. They don't like the idea of their leaving the country; but it is not that so much they are afraid of: *what they really fear is that their boys will be corrupted.* Your schools will certainly appeal to the parents, and your League will be a vast machinery to bring the advantages of these schools to the notice of the parents. I wish well to your scheme with all my heart.'

The reference to a league will be explained hereafter. Meanwhile, is there an employer of labour, a squire, or a parson in the country, acquainted with the feelings of his humbler neighbours, who will not endorse the bishop's judgment? Every one of these must be aware that the Army is looked upon as a most undesirable career for the sons of the working classes, and that it is generally considered a domestic calamity when the son of respectable parents enlists. It is best to face this unpalatable truth boldly, otherwise the evil influence will never be stemmed at its source. No recruiting officer must inquire too scrupulously into the character and antecedents of men presenting themselves for enlistment. Practically all that he must do—all that we can afford to let him do under the voluntary system—is to take reasonable precautions against fraudulent enlistment. We cannot hope to fill the ranks with the *élite* of the working classes; some of the 'scum' must be admitted and manufactured into good material. 'But we can surely make an attempt to protect respectable youths from the danger of contact at their most impressionable age from the inevitable evil communications which they must encounter if plunged straight into barrack-room life.

It would be absurd to claim for Captain Maitland's scheme that it will render young fellows immune from corruption by a kind of moral vaccination; but surely it is not too much to claim for it that it affords the means of considerable protection to the recruit, who will not be entirely raw when he enters the ranks, and will have acquired some, at least, of the steel of discipline and moral restraint so necessary before he is placed in a common sleeping and living room with comrades who are not all desirable. The establishment of King Edward's Schools will provide an intermediate step between the life of the lad and the life of the soldier. It will save numbers of young men from drifting into uselessness, and will tend, if anything can do so, to remove the prevalent repugnance which respectable parents certainly entertain against the Army as a profession for their boys.

I have explained above the circumstances which have prevented me from ascertaining from presumably the most competent authority—the Inspector-General of Recruiting—the objections which may be raised against the foundation of these schools; but some of them are so obvious that they may be considered in advance. Probably the most obvious, as well as the most formidable, is that of expense. What is the value of any scheme, it may be asked, which does not contain an estimate of the cost nor indicate the source whence that cost is to be defrayed? Well, the answer to that is contained partly in the nature of the proposal itself. It is not necessary to set on foot King Edward's Schools simultaneously in all regimental districts. The experiment might be tried at first by the establishment of one such school in each of the three kingdoms. The cost of each would not be formidable, and if the experiment proved a failure in result, the undertaking might be dropped after a fair period of trial. It would be necessary to give the lads a small sum as pocket-money to act as a retaining-fee—say 2*d.* or 3*d.* a day, in addition to their board, lodging, and clothing. It is believed that this trifling daily pay might be defrayed out of Army funds. The expense of school staff, clothing, and subsistence must be voted by Parliament, unless it can be met by means suggested by Captain Maitland, to be mentioned presently.

Assuming, meanwhile, that the expense of these schools were borne by the public, the objection will be raised that it is bad economy to keep boys for two years or two years and a half before they are fit for service. Setting aside the analogy of training-ships, which nobody considers a bad investment, it may be answered that the public is already paying for a large number of such lads who have enlisted under age. It is of the nature of the case that the exact number of these cannot be ascertained, but it is notorious that such is the fact, and must continue the fact in the absence of any power to call for certificates of birth. These immature recruits are the most costly of all the servants of the State, and enormously swell

the hospital returns both at home and on foreign service. Moreover, many and many a young soldier gets into the regimental defaulters' book through sheer inexperience and want of disciplinary habit. Initial blunders, which figure as 'crimes' after enlistment, would be got over during the preliminary training, and the recruit would start with a clean sheet, or, rather, with no sheet at all, and his eyes open. Strained through the meshes of a King Edward's School there would be small chance of recruits enlisting under a fictitious age.

I now come to part of Captain Maitland's scheme which I hesitate to endorse, and therefore give in his own words.

To find the boys I would call into play an agency which is ready to our hands and only waiting to be used. All over the country there are tens of thousands of people who would be glad to be shown a very definite way by which they could at once benefit the Army, and raise the tone of the young men in their respective neighbourhoods.

Take, for example, the regimental district of Somersetshire. The present recruiting system of one Recruiting Officer and so many Sergeants seems to meet with qualified success. With the new method the local Recruiting Officer puts himself in communication with and invites the cordial co-operation of every individual in the district—town and country—who may be interested in soldiering. Every man of title, every Member of Parliament, every magistrate, local magnate, every parish minister, every minister indeed of every denomination, the heads of Lads' Brigades and Church Brigades, every Rifle Association, and those interested in shooting who may not belong to an Association, all rich people who (from whatever motive) have money or land to give, and all those of moderate or small incomes who, though they may have no money to give, may be interested in good works, all these different people form a Victoria Army League, to whom we will look for assistance, among other things, in the finding of recruits.

The Victoria Army League thus formed, of which the Lord Lieutenant of the County might be President, consists as we see of all sorts and conditions of people all over the regimental district, every parish containing at least one or two members. They all have one object: the finding of good recruits and the elevating of the tone of the Army.

When the recruit has once joined they will continue by their help, influence, and sympathy to be of incalculable benefit to him. The League will have funds which rich men will endow. These funds to be managed by the Victoria Army League Council, appointed by the members in each district. The Commandant of the local King Edward's School would point out in what direction the applying of these funds would most benefit the recruit—*e.g.*, to meet the cost of the Recruits' Rifle Clubs, Game Clubs, &c.

My reason for refraining from advocating this part of Captain Maitland's proposal is founded upon disinclination to add to the large and perplexing number of leagues already existing. All over the country, in every county and in almost every parish of Great Britain, there is established the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association. It is true that the object of this institution is to provide for the families of men who *have served* their country; but perhaps its constitution is elastic enough to be extended in order to induce young men to enter the Service under more promising auspices

than are possible at present. At all events, there is the machinery in working order, if it can be applied to the work under consideration.

Failing that Association there is the Army League and Imperial Defence Association, recently founded under the presidency of Lord Blythswood. Its aim and object were set forth in February in the first number of its monthly publication, *Our Flag*, from which the following is an extract :

Even if the Government be credited with an adequate comprehension of our military necessities, with knowledge of the means by which they may best be met and a determination to secure the object in view, it cannot be superfluous to show that the country is willing and anxious to co-operate by intelligent appreciation of its efforts, and by readiness to make the necessary sacrifices. So that whether we [the Army League] are called on to urge and stimulate, to criticise, or merely to endorse and support the action of the Executive, the expression of public opinion through the Army League cannot fail to be of service.

But in order that such opinion may have due weight, it is necessary that the public should be not merely aroused to a sense of our present insecurity, but informed, at least in general terms, of the conditions of Imperial Defence. It is in proportion to the intelligence of its suggestions that the popular desire, focussed in the Army League, will have authority and influence. We propose, then, to enter on our task without party bias, in no spirit of panic, with a desire to avoid hasty and immature suggestion or criticism; and to limit our advocacy to such expedients as may command the assent of all who are both thoughtful and well-informed. The presence in our councils of military experts, men of experience and knowledge, should secure the League against ignorant and imprudent action. . . . Our enterprise, commenced in the great and beneficent reign of our lamented Queen, must be matured under a new monarch and in a new century. That both reign and century may prove for England, worthy sequels to those that have preceded them must be the earnest wish of every patriotic Briton. The expansion of the Empire during the Victorian era has enormously increased our responsibilities. That it has also potentially enhanced our power to meet them has been recently shown in no doubtful manner. The 'greatest and most beneficent Empire the world has ever known' remains to us as a legacy from her who has now passed away as a monument to the sagacity, tact, and kindness which won the loyalty of her subjects in every quarter of the globe, while they secured, more perhaps than can ever be known, the peace of the world, the essential condition of growth and development. That this legacy shall remain unimpaired, this monument prove imperishable, must be the earnest wish of all.

Brave words, and behind them no doubt there are the right spirit and an earnest desire to keep the obligations of all patriotic men constantly before the public. But more valuable than words, more effective than any advocacy, however eloquent, of 'such expedients as may command the assent of all who are both thoughtful and well-informed,' would be some direct aid of one such expedient. If the Army League confines its exertions to advocating a scheme which shall command unanimous assent from the 'thoughtful and well-informed,' it is not likely to find much scope for its energy. When was a new scheme launched with *unanimous* approval?

Lastly, there is the Association formed under the auspices of this Review for study and application of the lessons of the war. To

their consideration I venture to submit Captain Maitland's proposal, in the belief that it is worthy of careful examination, and in the strong hope that it may be submitted to such practical criticism and amendment as may render it capable of carrying out the intentions of its author.

In conclusion, it is natural that doubts should be expressed about the prospect of inducing lads voluntarily to join King Edward's Schools. It must surely be in the experience of every one who has taken any active interest in the fortunes of his neighbours of the working class or of the families of those in his own employment, how often an institution such as one of these schools would have proved a boon in the case either of some lad whose inclination lay towards a soldier's life, or of one whom it was expedient to remove from the example and influence of undesirable parents, or of one who, by some venial act of youthful indiscretion, such as poaching, had incurred a degree of discredit in his own neighbourhood. At present there exists no haven into which active lads beyond school age can be steered by a friendly hand without forfeit of reputation. How great the number of waifs who might be saved by timely and discreet intervention of this sort, and turned into material of which the State stands in urgent need, it would be vain to speculate. That can only be ascertained by experiment. Fortunately the experiment may be made on a small scale at first at a relatively trifling cost, and, if successful, is capable of almost indefinite expansion.

HERBERT MAXWELL.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR ARMY REFORM

II

A MILITARY PROVIDENT FUND

IN the history of a nation every minute has its pressing necessity, every hour its problem. Yet does history repeat itself. The twentieth century has been ushered into a world to the sound of cannon, even as the preceding century opened its eyes in the tum-brel of an army.

Though other nations have devoted their best energies and resources to the invention and perfection of war materials, and to the maintenance of huge standing armies, it falls to England, who until now has been regarded as only a small military Power, to demonstrate for the first time the usage of smokeless powder and of long-range guns. The irony of fate has singled us out to make a practical test of the experiments of modern ingenuity and to revolutionise the theories of warfare manufactured in Berlin. It has also served to impress us with our necessity for military strength; and here, at the very outset of 1901, we may read in large letters of advertisement, 'Wanted: an Army!'

Again we are face to face with the problem of a hundred years ago, for by reference to the *Times* of the 22nd of January, 1801, we see that the number of men raised since the commencement of the war is estimated at 134,963, and upon further examination we find that nearly two-thirds of this number were obtained by means of the press-gang.

The press-gang is a thing of the past, no longer to be resorted to. In other countries the riddle is solved by conscription. In England conscription is out of the question. It would be regarded as a menace to our love of freedom, as a danger to the liberty of the subject. Consequently there remains nothing for us but to depend on the man who will take up the Army voluntarily. Now as the rank and file, owing to the exigencies of the profession of arms, can only consist of soldiers in the physical prime of life, we must consider in what way we can ameliorate the conditions of enlistment and render the service more attractive to the type of man we want.

When the engrossing topic of the hour is a question of recruiting it is natural that all the best brains of the Army should be occupied in dealing with this absorbing matter, and many and varied are the capable suggestions put forward. In catering for the improvement of the soldier's physical comfort, however, we should not overlook other matters more far-reaching in their influence on his morale and happiness; and in comparing the lot of the working man in other walks of life we must not ignore the disadvantages at which the private soldier finds himself with regard to home and home ties, disadvantages that are but scantily balanced by the glamour of a soldier's uniform. It is recognised by all students of social economy that the married state is calculated ethically and physically to produce the best qualities in the individual. Nowhere is this more emphatically apparent than in the Army, and nowhere is that married state less encouraged than in the ranks of that Army. Looking at it superficially, an unmarried regiment without the encumbrance and drag of wives and families may appear more facile to deal with from a theoretical point of view, but from my own personal observation as sometime adjutant of a cavalry regiment I have found that marriage in the greater majority of cases has a steadying influence on the soldier, thus forming a more useful servant for the State.

Under existing regulations only 7 per cent. of the men are allowed 'on the strength.' By this is meant an official recognition of the married status in the granting of certain advantages, such as free quarters in barracks, &c.

This means that in many cases the best type of man very properly feels that he is debarred from embracing the military service; and why? Because, added to the likelihood of constant change of quarters, and the chances of foreign service, he has the *certainty* that those he leaves behind him, when he embarks on active service, have *not* been provided for in the case of his death or disablement, and that, in the event of his marrying, the future of his widow or orphans would be unsecured.

No one who was in England during the melancholy autumn of 1899 can forget the cry of pity that went up when we came face to face with the saddest of all the horrors of warfare, the deserted hearth, robbed of the bread-winner, nor forget how gladly the wives and children of those at the front were cared for by the loyalty and gratitude of those who stayed at home. Only those who administered these patriotic funds know the difficulty and anxiety of penetrating far enough to succour those who were too proud to ask, and to discover those who had hidden themselves away, ashamed of their poverty.

But we must remember that this is the first great war in which we have been engaged since half a century, and that its novelty and pathos have touched all hearts; we must remember that should

a protracted struggle impoverish both the sympathy and purses of the nation it would be impossible to keep up the lavish record that has distinguished the last sixteen months.

The bread of charity is proverbially bitter, and the instinct of the male is to protect his own. Is it right, therefore, that the existence of the wives and children of the British Army should depend upon the whim and wealth of a generous people? Assuredly not! nor that the soldier should be exposed to the humiliation of public charity. The spectacle of the thousands running up into hundreds of thousands of golden sovereigns poured out at the feet of those 'he left behind him,' extraordinary indication as it was of British generosity, was also a lamentable example of our national want of foresight, and it is thus obviously the moment to propose the means of offering facilities to convert an uncertainty into a certainty and render the soldier's family independent of precarious support.

The object of this article is to point out how this may best be effected, and the suggestion that springs at once to the mind is that of a provident insurance, one that shall offer advantages to all those who may choose to avail themselves of it, from the general officer down to the private soldier in all and every branch of the service.

It will be remembered that nearly all the existing insurance offices on the eve of their clients' departure on active service insist on an extra premium being paid on their life policy, owing to war risks. Now it is manifestly not the business of a corporation framed for commercial purposes to take a sentimental view of the soldier's duty, and indeed to do so would be an injustice to the interests of its shareholders. Yet, at the same time, it is equally illogical and unjust that a man should be expected to pay heavily for the privilege of risking his life in our defence and in the defence of those same commercial interests.

According to the *Times* of October last, the leading insurance companies, at the cabled suggestion of Lord Roberts, reduced their premium to 2*l.* 2*s.* for all those officers who had taken permanent service in the new colonies. Whether they will be satisfied to continue this in face of the protracted prolongation of hostilities remains to be seen; in any case this is beside the question. The fact survives that the British officer, when called upon to fulfil the supreme duties of his profession, ready as he is to face the enhanced risks from bullets or disease, is obliged to make monetary sacrifices in order to insure the future of those dependent on him; while the private soldier, equally valiant, has only the poor satisfaction of knowing that his wife and children are practically left to a chance philanthropy.

In order to obviate this injustice, and yet to promote thrift and self-help, the plan that first recommends itself to us is that the Government should act in place of an insurance company, and encourage each man to subscribe a monthly item out of his pay. The subscription that the soldier could afford to pay, small item

though it be, would, in the aggregate, mount up into a considerable sum if the majority entered into this scheme.'

As an instance of what attraction a prosperous insurance office is able to offer, even when dealing with such diminutive subscriptions as twopence per week, the table of figures to be found on p. 579 is of interest. It is quoted from the prospectus of one of the leading companies for commercial assurance, but in perusing it it must be borne in mind that the figures given are based on the calculation of an annual subscription extending over an average life.

Judging the chances of war by the history of the recently ended century, we find that we have only been engaged in three campaigns great enough to necessitate the use of a large number of troops; so taking the chances into consideration—and chance is an all-important factor in all schemes of this kind—it is evident that the strain on the finances of this suggested military insurance would not be so great as appears at first sight. It may be said that certain regiments, owing to circumstances, may in ten years see more fighting than some others in a century; but in this scheme, in which the Government acts as banker to a co-operative provident fund for the whole army, it does not take a great financier to see that these risks equalise themselves.

This must in no way interfere with the present system of pensions or annuities, as it would be entirely voluntary on the part of the individual. The object of the subscription would be as follows:—

In the event of death in the King's service a sum of money, according to rate, to be paid to the next of kin; in the event of disablement to the insurer.

Should he survive the insurer would be able to draw the net total of his premium upon his discharge.

For this purpose a soldier would pay a periodical subscription from the date of his entering the Army until his death or discharge. As it is, however, extremely probable that the young soldier would be unwilling to undertake such charges for a distant possibility while unmarried, he should be allowed at any period of his military career to become a member of the fund by paying arrears without interest. Facilities should be open to him to make good these payments in regulated instalments through the commander of his unit; or, should he so elect, the balance could be diverted from his daily pay. The advantage that this would afford to the investor is greater than that held out to the client of a civil insurance office, and it also enables the private to insure himself for any sum, however small. But the object of the scheme is not purely philanthropic, it is also to obtain corresponding advantages to the State—that of offering inducements to the steady, hard-working man to take up the Army as his profession. In a world in which the saying holds good, 'Nothing for nothing, and very little for sixpence,' this must be paid for, and in hard money.

To put it concisely, the Government should insure the British soldier by paying a sum equal and in addition to every instalment put down by him.

In the event of his death his next of kin would thus get double the money for which he had insured himself.

But in the event of his survival and retirement from the Army he would, of course, draw only the sum total of what he had paid during his term of service, while the remainder of the bonus granted by the insurance office would revert to the Government and so further the continuance of the fund.

It is a question whether the man who joins the fund some years after entering the Army is entitled to enjoy the same advantages as the man who has belonged to it from the first, and whose money has thus accumulated to the credit of the Government. It might be found advisable to double the entire sum only in the case of the latter and more provident soldier, while the amount of help given to the former would be a matter for future calculation based on the number of years during which the subscription had been paid.

At this point we have to face the problem as to how this charge may best be met. For to suggest taxation at a moment like this is to put the idea outside the pale of practical politics. From the regimental funds we can hope to get nothing; the demands on the officer's purse also are already too serious. Equally unfair would it be to apply any of the canteen profits to this purpose, as those accruing from that institution belong to the men, and thus in both cases the insurers would be paying twice over. Therefore it is to the Government we must look for the furtherance of the scheme. As sooner or later we shall have to face the fact that money must be spent on the amelioration of the British soldier's prospects, and as at the present time much thought is devoted to the improvement of the Army in general, it is undoubtedly better that the Government should put its hand in its pocket for a comparatively small sum *now* than ten years later, when money may be even scarcer than at present, and when the country may be called upon to furnish a sum ten times larger to provide the man it might entice so cheaply at this moment.

There may be sources of income known to those in the War Department that could be applied to this purpose, sources that they are better able to suggest than the regimental officer.

As to the practical management of the fund, much expense might be spared by saving a clerical staff, if arrangements could be made by the Government with some existing insurance company to take over the whole business; the latter on their side would be enabled to dispense with the expenses of agents and collectors, as this part of the work would be undertaken by the squadron or company's officers. In view of the magnitude of the undertaking and the

undeniable security there is no doubt that far more favourable terms would be given to the Government than to the individual.

I have not here attempted to work out the idea comprehensively, as would an actuary; nor have I presumed to touch upon the wider question of Army improvements. Much has been said, much is being said, of the expense of the Army as a profession for officers. It is earnestly to be hoped that a great deal of attention will be given to this subject. The expenses of an officer's life are such as to preclude the possibility of a provision for the future out of his pay, and in this the officer is no better off than the rank and file, and these suggestions for mutual assurance would benefit men of all degrees equally.

Of course I am well aware that such a scheme should be exhaustively and carefully gone into by experts before it could be entertained; but if, by pointing out that the Army is the only profession that has no provident fund, attention has been drawn to this want, it would be satisfactory to feel that some little step has been taken towards remedying an evil at a time when Army matters are the burning question of the hour, at a time when we are setting in order our military house, that we may preserve our very existence as a powerful nation.

ARRAN,

Captain, Royal Horse Guards.

The following table is taken from the prospectus of one of the leading London assurance companies.

WEEKLY PREMIUM OF TWOPENCE

Age next birthday	After one year		After five years		After ten years	
	£	s.	£	s.	£	s.
18	17	12	18	0	18	10
19	17	2	17	10	18	0
20	16	12	17	0	17	8
21	16	2	16	10	16	18
22	15	12	16	0	16	8
23	15	4	15	12	16	0
24	14	4	15	2	15	8
25	14	6	14	4	15	0

It demonstrates what sums can be assured for such small subscriptions as twopence, and according to the suggested scheme for a Military Provident Fund the soldier's subscription would be doubled by the Government. The enormous business thus accruing to the company should compensate for the fact that these data are based on a calculation of life-long subscription, whereas the period of the soldier's insurance would in most cases be at death or at the expiration of twelve years. It is, of course, obvious that officers would insure themselves for larger sums, and probably for life.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR ARMY REFORM

III

ARMY NURSING

[I HAVE read the subjoined article at the request of the writer. Miss McCaul's extensive acquaintance with nursing in this country and her exceptional experience in a Field Hospital in Natal enable her to speak with authority.

I am sure that her suggestions for the much-needed reform of Army Nursing will commend themselves to all those who have taken interest in this important matter.—FREDERICK TREVES.]

AFTER reading the Report of the South African Hospitals Commission and the evidence contained therein, and after bringing my own personal experience to bear (gained in a Field Hospital which followed General Buller's column up to the relief of Ladysmith), I have come to the conclusion that a great many of the alleged grievances are genuine, and are due to the fact that Army Nursing is worked on an impossible system, without any pretensions to business or method, and without reasonable regard for the requirements of modern nursing.

It is much to be regretted that the Commissioners, in their recommendations, have not touched upon the great question of Army Nursing. It is stated very emphatically that reforms are urgently needed in the Army Medical Service, and those who read the evidence upon which the Commissioners' report is based, will have little doubt in their minds that reforms are still more urgently needed in the matter of nursing in the Army.

Without discussing the numerous grievances, complaints, and 'scandals,' and without entering into particulars as to my own personal experience among the wounded at the front, I may proceed at once to indicate the directions in which it appears to me that reform is needed in this important branch of the service.

The matter may be considered under the following headings:

- (1) The Status of the Army Nursing Department.
- (2) The Method of Admission into the Service.
- (3) The System of the Nursing Reserve.

- (4) The Training of the Orderly.
- (5) The Disposal of Hospital Comforts.
- (6) The Field Hospital Equipment.

1. THE STATUS OF THE ARMY NURSING DEPARTMENT

Unless the War Office is prepared to place Army Nursing on a proper business footing, with a recognised head and staff, who would be made responsible, not only for a high standard of nursing, but also for the entire management of the details incident to nursing throughout the Army, there will be no cessation of complaints. The recommendation of the Royal Commission to increase the number of nurses sounds hopeful; but if the nursing staff be increased by hundreds there will be no substantial advance made in Army nursing so long as it remains under the present Netley system.

The first all-important reform will come when the War Office recognises the fact that the Lady-Superintendent and her nurses are an absolute necessity to the Army. A corps for nursing, entirely independent of the R.A.M.C., should be established, corresponding to other official departments. The Lady-Superintendent should be looked upon as a Government official and be held responsible for nursing and its details. Army Nursing cannot be properly administered until a woman's influence is felt through every branch of it, from the base depot to the far distant field hospital. Officers and civilians have again and again denied the existence of a Lady-Superintendent at Netley in such a way as to show that she is not a sufficiently recognised head. Her position in the Army Nursing Department should be on the same footing as is that of the Director-General in the R.A.M.C. There is a fault in the method by which the Lady-Superintendent is elected. The Director-General alone has the power of appointment. No one man should have this right. The election should be made by a suitable council, which should include three matrons from large civil hospitals. Candidates for the post of Lady-Superintendent should have worked their way up through the grades of military nursing. This appointment should be the goal for which the younger sisters should aim.

The salary of the Lady-Superintendent should be raised and should certainly not be less than 300*l.* a year.

2. THE METHOD OF ADMISSION INTO THE SERVICE

The difficulty of this subject is great, and to say one word against the Army-sister at this moment may appear hard and unsympathetic after the self-sacrificing work she has done. The kindness and courtesy I have received from them, one and all, in South Africa, will always be present to my mind, and I trust none will take my

criticisms in other than the spirit in which they are intended. The Director-General's power over the nursing staff, according to the 'Army Medical Regulations,' paragraph 143, is expressed as follows: 'No sister will be selected or dismissed without his sanction being previously obtained in each case.' This position would appear to be entirely wrong. The Lady-Superintendent should have a voice in the choosing of her own nurses, and these matters should, if need be, go before a nursing council.

There seems to me to be a want of justice in the way in which a sister becomes a superintendent. The following is from Sir Henry Burdett's book, *The Nursing Profession*:

The female nursing is classified as follows: 1. Lady-Superintendent; 2. Senior Nursing Sisters, acting as Superintendents; 3. Nursing Sisters. The two former classes will, as a rule, but not necessarily, be filled up from the grade below, by selection on grounds of experience, administrative capacity, and personal fitness.

It should be made impossible for any but an Army sister to fill the higher grade. What is to prevent favouritism and the filling of these posts from the civil nursing community? Surely, there must always be women in the Army suitable for these appointments. If not, it shows that a very indifferent standard of qualifications is expected on their admission to the service. If the position of Superintendent is open to the civilian, it does away entirely with nursing ambition in the Army, and this in itself must be detrimental to the department.

Nurses should rise solely by their merits as nurses.

Again, the Army regulation for the retirement of a nurse is from the age of fifty to sixty. To my mind the retiring age should be forty-five. A nurse at the age of forty-five is a far older woman than is an ordinary woman at that age. Of course it is a serious thing for a woman of forty-five to find herself among the unemployed, and therefore a suitable pension should be provided. I think more actual and detailed nursing should be expected of the Army sister. Under the present régime she can always turn to the orderly to do the actual nursing. She is not indispensable, but may claim to be a very pleasant adjunct to the Army. This is shown by the following extract from 'Regulations for Army Medical Services,' paragraph 151: 'They (the nurses) will be present and render assistance at surgical operations, if required.' In large civil hospitals, an operation is not performed without the assistance of a nurse; the nurse is indispensable. If the Army sister were made to feel that the main honour and responsibility of the nursing rested with her and that she was absolutely necessary to the department, there would be more earnest work done.

I know of no rule which prevents a nurse, who has been engaged in private nursing, from entering the Army. I am sure, however, that a nurse who has been so engaged is quite unsuitable. Private nursing

should be a point of disqualification and only nurses should be admitted into the service who come direct from a recognised hospital.

How to get the immediate improvement of the Army sister is indeed a difficult question. It would be well for the senior sisters over forty-five to be requested to retire, on a suitable retiring pension. Many nurses who have been working for Government during the present stress of work have come direct from large hospitals. An offer should be made to these nurses to enter the Army service, and it would be desirable that the remainder of the Army sisters should go through a three months' course of modern nursing in a civil hospital.

3. THE SYSTEM OF THE NURSING RESERVE

The present system upon which the Army draws its nursing reserve is almost ludicrous. Any nurse who has a certificate of three years' hospital training can apply to be taken on the Reserve. Many of the Army Reserve sisters are without doubt exceedingly nice and able women, although quite unfitted to nurse soldiers. Most of them have been engaged in private nursing for some years—an occupation which renders them useless when they come to re-enter any hospital, military or civil. They have lost touch with discipline, with the routine of ward work, and very often with modern surgery. Of course there are exceptions to this rule, but we have to deal with the many, not the few. Private nurses should indeed be disqualified for the Reserve. A nurse on leaving her hospital should forfeit her position as an Army Reserve sister.

There should be Reserve matrons as well as Reserve sisters. The principal large training hospitals should have their matrons on the Nursing Reserve. If three matrons were elected every two years the large hospitals would be duly represented in turn and fresh vigour and new ideas would be brought perpetually into Army nursing.

The matrons of every large training school would feel proud to furnish the Government with perfectly trained hospital nurses. No one should be allowed to enter her name for a Reserve nurse until she had entered her third year of hospital training.

4. THE TRAINING OF THE ORDERLY

We have no system in England for the training of male nurses, so it is not surprising that the military training of men nurses is practically a farce. The scanty instruction represented by a few months' training at Netley or the Herbert Hospitals under the medical officers and sisters can scarcely be looked upon as a serious endeavour to teach the orderly the art of nursing, although they

have to pass an examination and appear to have grades in this elementary form of instruction.

It is not clear to me how it happens that a man, who is naturally unsuited for nursing, becomes a trained nurse under the Netley system, when it takes a woman, who is born with the instincts of nursing, three years!

A year devoted to the art of nursing would not be overmuch for any man to give who wishes to acquire sufficient knowledge to fit him for nursing in the military hospitals.

I have heard a suggestion to do away with orderlies altogether. This is impossible, and no one who has seen anything of military nursing would give the proposal a second thought. On the contrary, the orderly is as important as any other individual in the medical service. The thing to aim at is a proper training for these men, with a pay in proportion to their improved training. The present system of Ward Master is a mistake when there is a Sister-in-charge, as she should have absolute nursing control over the orderly. I could spend much time in describing the ignorance and squalor of orderlies in the matter of nursing, but it would be neither kind nor just; the blame of ignorance does not rest with them.

The question of the training of the orderly is a very large one. I would only point out here that it would be well if the training of a certain number of orderlies could be undertaken in the male wards of certain civil hospitals. There would be little difficulty in the way of the War Office making mutually advantageous arrangements with civil hospitals for such training. Moreover, the civil surgeon would learn something of the possibilities of the male nurse, for there can be no doubt that male nurses should be much more largely employed in civil as well as in army practice than they are. A demand for male nurses in private life would soon lead to an active enlistment in the R.A.M.C. Female nurses should be much more extensively employed in times of war than is the custom at present.

The Royal Commission condemns the idea of female nurses being 'employed in Field Hospitals or at the front. No one,' say the Commissioners, 'knowing the conditions under which these Field Hospitals have to work would suggest that they should be so employed.' So far as the advanced Field Hospitals are concerned this statement is correct, but it certainly does not apply to the second line of Field Hospitals. There can be no doubt that the two Army sisters who worked in No. 4 Field Hospital (the hospital to which I was attached) did the most useful and valuable work ever done in the annals of Army nursing, and if it were recognised that two or four Army sisters could always follow the column, as we did, there would be no difficulty in selecting suitable women for this really grand service. In any case, female nurses ought to be exclusively

employed in Stationary Field Hospitals and in Base Hospitals, and the orderly at the base should be done away with.

5. THE DISPOSAL OF HOSPITAL COMFORTS

Government should not depend on the charitable public for bare necessities; and for such gifts as are accepted for the sick and wounded there should be a proper means of distribution. The Royal Commission refers to the lack of organisation in the following paragraph:

There must have been some waste owing to the overlapping of the various charities and charitable gifts, and to the difficulty of properly distributing the same amongst those who needed them. In future wars it would be advisable, if possible, that some provision should be made by which all charitable gifts should be received and dealt with by one organised body.

The great need for organisation in this matter must have occurred to the minds of many. A properly appointed Government office in each large town at the base, superintended by an Army sister, would have rectified this evil.

When war broke out every woman in England, from the highest to the lowest, plied her needle to make shirts and comforts for the wounded as loyally as the soldier himself fought. Thousands of shirts and pyjamas were made, every facility was afforded by large shipping firms to forward these comforts. Man, woman, and child grasped the necessity for such things being to hand. All went well until they reached Africa: then what became of the shirts is hard to say. That they never reached the front can be vouched for, and bundle after bundle must be lying about even now at Cape Town, Durban, and other large centres. Now, supposing a Government Receiving Office for comforts for the wounded had been opened at Cape Town, East London, and Durban, what confusion and disappointment would have been saved! Supposing at Cape Town all parcels had been sent to the Receiving Office to be opened and sorted by a lay staff of colonial ladies, superintended by an Army sister, who would have decided which garments were most suitable to each place at the front. No parcel should have been allowed to be sent out for the comfort of the sick and wounded until a Government label had been procured. This label should have been stamped, 'Government Receiving Office.' In the same way colonial parcels, given by the ladies of the colony, should not have been used until they had been through the Receiving Offices. Then there would have been an official recognition of the enormous amount of work undertaken by these ladies. The office would have been a centre for all medical officers to apply to when short of comforts—in fact, it would be a perfectly organised depot for these articles (entirely worked by women), containing not only shirts,

pyjamas, &c., but tobacco, newspapers, and periodicals. Very little additional expense would be incurred by these offices, while every one would have the satisfaction of knowing that their labours had not been in vain.

I know, at Cape Town for instance, there was a large store, where civilians tried to sort the enormous amount of goods, and sergeants of the different regiments came to look for their regimental parcels. I also understand that a corporal or sergeant aided the civilian in this hard work, and that there was an official looking-up at night. I mention this to show that there was an attempt made at some organisation, but that this attempt failed is only too well known.

An enormous number of troops will remain in Africa, and for many a long day comforts for the sick will continue to pour in ; therefore these offices should be started at once to cope with parcels going out as well as those already there.

6. THE FIELD HOSPITAL EQUIPMENT

With regard to Field Hospitals a marked improvement could be made in their equipment without adding to the transport and yet adding to the comfort of the wounded. The Commission reminds us that a

Field Hospital is only intended for the temporary treatment of patients and has no female nurses ; it moves with the advancing army, and its usefulness depends upon its power of free movements and the means that are provided in the shape of stationery and general hospitals along the lines of communications for its rapid and frequent evacuations with the view of giving it that mobility that is so essential for the proper fulfilment of its function, it carries an extremely light equipment, it has no beds, but is supplied with eight stretchers, it is provided with no invalid clothing, and in other respects it is only equipped with the bare necessities for the treatment of 100 patients.

There are occasions, however, when Field Hospitals have to become stationary for a time, which fact will be seen from the Report in Part III.

In this respect Lord Methuen's advance had a great advantage over that of Lord Roberts, which, during the greater part of it, had no line of railway as a communication with the base, and where, accordingly, the field hospitals were of necessity, for a considerable period, used as fixed hospitals.

Improvements, therefore, which could be made in their equipment without adding to transport ought to be earnestly taken into consideration as tending to diminish the rough nursing which is almost unavoidable at present in a Field Hospital.

Surgical overalls should be provided for surgeons and orderlies. The dirty condition of the orderlies' hands and clothes is beyond description. The only plan would be to envelop him in a large over-all and provide him with rubber gloves. The orderly in his present condition of squalor is a positive danger to surgery. I once

heard a very witty saying about a suppurating case, that the patient was suffering from 'Orderly poisoning'!

Transport for four nurses only should be provided to follow each large mobile Field Hospital. Two nursing vans, much after the style of gipsy caravans, in which the sisters could sleep by night and take their meals by day, having all their personal baggage with them, would serve the purpose. A neat Government field-uniform should be substituted for the Netley one.

The nurses for the front should be carefully chosen; they should have a knowledge of cooking, and should be able to adapt themselves and their appliances to field-hospital work. The Netley sister can take no part in this type of work until she has been freed from the present Army system.

From my own personal knowledge of how we women stood the strain and climate, the argument that women are too delicate for the work is not sound. Before any final decision is given to this scheme, let me implore, for the soldier's sake, that it should have due consideration. The question must touch the highest in command and the lowest in the ranks.

As Field Hospitals have a transport of their own, I suggest that each Field Hospital should have a small waggon to contain nursing appliances for 100 men. Now, if it is possible for a Field Hospital to have a waggon in its transport, it is quite as possible that it should be a waggon with some value. Because it should be constructed as a sort of miniature store house, there is no reason that it should add to the number of waggons, but rather, if thoroughly well planned, should diminish labour and bulk. There are occasions, every one knows, when Field Hospitals must do away with even waggons and have to trust to packed transport; then, of course, my waggon would be as useless as any other waggon; but these occasions are, we hope, rare.

Some of the advantages that would be attainable by this waggon are these. It would do away with many packing cases, save the orderlies' time and labour when a hospital was pitched, and an orderly in charge would give out from the waggon all nursing appliances. The same would apply when a hospital was struck—there would be one place to which all the orderlies would have to take their nursing appliances.

Those who have not seen the mushroom-like growth of these hospitals cannot possibly understand the necessity for more distinct method. Time is the one important thing; very often the wounded are waiting to come in. The word time also applies to the striking of a hospital. In the hurry and scurry of retreat the only way to save time is by having method.

The actual nursing requisites to be packed into this waggon could, in many cases, be greatly increased if suitable patterns and materials were used.

ETHEL MCCAUL.

THE MODESTY OF ENGLISHWOMEN

ARE Englishwomen less modest than they used to be?

This question may fairly be asked as a sort of pendant to a lively controversy which occupied the public mind during some of the last few weeks of the old century. There is still a portion of the public mind capable of realising that there are problems in the making and the keeping of empire which cannot be settled on the battlefield or by military prestige.

The modern stage was once more under discussion. If in the multitude of counsellors there be wisdom, a rich harvest ought to be ready for the gathering. Here were eminent actors and managers, eminent dramatic critics and literary men generally, a stray archbishop even—here was, in short, everybody who may be supposed to be an authority on the subject, hurling opinions at everybody else, with very little appearance of agreement as to the moral judgment to be passed on particular plays, but with a good deal of unanimity on three important points. *First*, a general admission that many modern plays are objectionable, and are a menace to the moral health of the community; *second*, a perfect hopelessness of good which would result from any serious attempt at official censorship; and *third*, and most emphatic of all, an opinion that the public, which ought to be its own censor, likes these objectionable plays and demands them, and that, of course, a supply is always forthcoming. It may be worth while to follow up the last point in this aggregate of opinion by a consideration of the remarkable and significant attitude which the women of our day seem, by some sort of tacit agreement, to have taken towards the much-discussed subject.

We have been told many times during the latter half of the last century that the great movement for the higher education of women would have this important result among many others: that women, as soon as they were fitted to take their proper share in national life, would have a purifying and elevating influence upon it, and upon public morality; that their private influence had always been great, but that as soon as they awakened to the fact that they had public as well as private duties we should see a great change for the better

in all such matters. Now it is certain that the time has come when women have both the ability and the power to act as the natural and most efficient censors of the theatre; if they chose to boycott objectionable plays, these plays would become impossible instead of being the phenomenally successful things they are. But what is the fact? What sort of plays please the modern girl? What of the great theatrical hits of the last few seasons, and what of the crowd of women and girls who have patronised and made them paying ventures? It ought to be no part of the purpose of the social reformer to complain that the stage deals with the sad and perplexing problems which follow on the sins and weaknesses of men and women, especially on those which arise from the relations between men and women. The stage must not taboo the subject any more than must the pulpit, if it is ever to be the teacher of moral and social righteousness, which it ought to be and might be. But the social reformer has a right to complain of the way in which the stage too often treats these questions. Vice is glossed over by 'humorous' situations, or tricked out in a false sentimentality; men, and especially women, are continually represented as condoning immorality under the assumption that passion, and not honour, reason and duty, ought to be the ruling impulse; indecency is only saved from its native sordidness and ugliness by the consummate art of an actor or an actress, by splendid dresses, sparkling music, and superb mounting in general.

There is a recent example which well supports the accusation. Recall to mind a certain play as it was produced in London last year, a play in one scene of which a woman undressed herself to a very considerable extent in full view of the house, and pretended to undress herself more completely than she actually did. Then think of the marvellous success of the piece, think of thousands of refined-looking and well-dressed women who calmly and comfortably watched this performance in the company of their brothers and sweethearts and others. What did it mean? What was the explanation? How could presumably modest women countenance such a play?

One or two explanations seem almost certain, and there is a possible third which ought not to be overlooked.

Either women have come to the astonishing conclusion that the drama—in its very essence a picture of human life and doing—has been entirely lifted out of all human life, so that indecency may be permitted and gazed upon in a theatre which they would not sanction by their presence, except under compulsion, in any other place. (Or else the women and girls of the day are simply immodest, enjoy the indecency of the theatre, knowing it to be indecent; and the explanation of the fact that they would not tolerate the same thing outside its walls must be that the spirit and soul of modesty has departed, leaving behind only a remnant of its outer conventional

form and dress. One would be glad to think that the former thesis, absurd as it appears, is the correct solution of the psychological enigma, but a further consideration of the whole subject will perhaps prove that there are too many apparent confirmations of the other to make that likely. As has been already said, there is also a third way possible of accounting for the present attitude of women towards such performances, but it will be more convenient to discuss it later on.

To return to the question which forms the starting-point :—

It is easy enough to ask such a question, but very difficult indeed to give any sort of answer which will be regarded as satisfactory. The very moment one attempts consideration of a big social subject, one plunges into a bewildering maze of opinion and experience. There is one's own experience. Then there are other experiences which command attention and respect. It becomes more difficult every day to form and to hold a definite position.

The very terms of the question are debatable. What is 'Modesty'? A limit: some dividing line which must not be overstepped by women chiefly in their relations with the other sex? Modesty certainly implies limit; so strongly does it imply it that many people loosely imagine the limit, and not only the limit, but the actual position of the limit to be the modesty. They confuse modesty, the thing itself, with the mere outward expression of feeling. But very little reflection will show that this is a careless and superficial view, which cannot be logically held—which no one does really hold. Moreover, did modesty depend upon the place of the limit, such a discussion as the present one would be superfluous. For it is perfectly easy to show that of late years the limit has changed its place in a most remarkable manner—in some instances it has disappeared altogether—but it would be rash to assume that *therefore* there is no modesty nowadays. If modesty is to depend upon the position of the limit, the question is at once taken out of the regions of controversy, and must be settled by some arbitrary power which every one will recognise and obey. But that is out of the question, and we have to admit that conduct which would ruin the reputation of one woman must be considered perfectly correct and natural in the case of another; that, in short, modesty is the same moral quality everywhere and at all times, though the conventional expression of it is bound to vary under different circumstances, with changing customs and in different ages.

Take, for example, the matter of dress. Here is a Highland lassie, driving her cattle down the hillsides of lonely Arran, her skirts kilted up to the knee, allowing of a liberal display of shapely bare leg, foot, and ankle. We may take it that she does not feel the least sense of outraged modesty in her occasional encounters with the male native, or even with the tourist. But try to imagine her, in full

possession of her own personality and prejudices, suddenly put into a modern evening gown, on that same Highland hillside, and let the society girl—just as suddenly, and with as little preparation for the change—be set down in the other costume in a fashionable ball-room, and try to imagine the result. You know perfectly well that an opinion of the modesty of either woman, founded upon the quantity, or length, or height of the clothes either of them wears, is likely to do the one or the other, or both, an injustice. So it is to be imagined that most people will concede the point that the modesty or immodesty of any particular form of dress must be judged by the result of an inquiry into its suitability to the wearer, the circumstances under which it is worn, and its intention—the feeling of which it is only the outward and visible sign. The demands of English modern life have revolutionised women's own ideas of dress, and it is generally admitted that the changes are for the better. Whatever charge of immodesty may be brought, it does not seem to be shown to any marked extent in dress. Naturally so; because it is very easy for immodesty to pay tribute to modesty in this particular.

But it has already been claimed that the conventional expression of the moral quality is bound to vary, not only with varying circumstances, but with changing customs and in different ages. May not this proposition bear upon some aspects of the theatre problem, and form the third possible explanation of the indifference of women to what we assume, perhaps only on account of prejudice, to be indecency? Keeping to the same illustration, is it really indecent for a woman to undress herself before hundreds of spectators of both sexes, and is it really indecent of the spectators to look on? No one will dispute the fact that women do many things to-day which would have filled people with genuine shame and horror fifty years ago, but which we calmly accept as part of ordinary decorous behaviour. To take just a few instances: women travel alone and unattended, make use of public restaurants, play cricket and other 'manly' games, bicycle, speak in public, fill public positions on school boards and as guardians of the poor. It is amusing to think swiftly and suddenly back to fifty or sixty years ago, and then slowly forward, in order to mark how each of these various necessities, recreations, and duties has had in its turn to pass through the stages of horror and uplifted hands, disapproval and shoulder-shrugs, ridicule and smiles, then serious discussion, followed by hearty approval and general adoption. And all these quickly changing opinions and customs lead to an irresistible and startling question.

Is modesty after all—and by modesty is strictly meant not any of the outward manifestations of it, but the real sentiment itself—is modesty necessarily innate in pure-minded women, or is it merely an artificial defence against an impure environment? If, as modern idealists believe, the Golden Age lies before us, and not behind, may

it not be reasonable to suppose that women will require less and less of the consciousness which we call 'modesty'? Would there be the same need for it in an infinitely purer society than any which the world has yet known? There is much significance in the fact that that old myth of the ancient world which relates the story of the birth of modesty connects it with an acquired knowledge of evil and loss of innocence. It is certain that children acquire modesty only when they begin, however dimly, to feel conscious of evil, not necessarily to know evil. And the quicker the intelligence, and the keener the perceptions, the more quickly does a finely strung moral nature shrink before evil, and so defend itself from a premature corrupting knowledge. No doubt all this is extreme, and might be considered extremely idealistic, yet it may shed a little light upon some puzzling latter-day questions.

The nineteenth century, and particularly the latter half of it, has witnessed a greater change in the position of women than has happened in any former period of social history. They have claimed and taken freedom to an extent which is surely causing their grandmothers and great-grandmothers many a turn in their graves. And it scarcely requires an effort of memory to recall the dismal prophecies which were made during the earlier days of their demand for higher education, and for freedom from the irritating and merely conventional restraints which from time immemorial had narrowed their intelligence and hindered their power and effectiveness in the world. They were constantly told that they would become mannish, lose in grace and charm, and, above all, would be likely to throw aside modesty and reserve. This last point is the only one we are concerned with at present.

It was quite inevitable that, in the struggle towards the new ideals, women should hasten to rid themselves of everything which appeared likely to hinder. The girls of to-day probably do not trouble their heads about the changes, cannot realise them, and their contemptuous surprise when reminded of the constraints of body and mind under which their grandmothers patiently lived their lives marks the distance travelled. Only those who stand midway between youth and age can appreciate and estimate the change. They themselves have been the first to enter into the enjoyment of freedom gained by the courage and self-sacrifice of their elder sisters. The personal memory of the struggle has sanctified it, and made it imperative on them to accept with reverence and thankfulness the larger life with all its possibilities.

But, after all, how far has the higher education of women gone? And how many women have cared about the struggle, except for the greater liberty it has given them? Practically it is open to all women—not university training—that for both men and women is still a dream of the future; the point is that women, apart from

physical disabilities, are no longer debarred by sex and social prejudice from taking whatever of education, training, and occupation is open to men; subject only, as men still are, to the restrictions imposed by social position and the demands of material existence. Are the women of to-day taking advantage of the possibilities which life offers them? Again no general or summary answer is possible. Many women, particularly in the lower middle class, are doing their best with their freedom, though the strain of competition for livelihood, which so far has always fallen in its ultimate and most soul-crushing form on women, is an ever-present factor to be reckoned with.

But even the most optimistic of the women leaders and thinkers must admit that there is a vast residuum, both in the upper social circles and the lower, which has seized liberty without accepting or even understanding the responsibilities which liberty has brought. Thousands of women were ready for the change; for them the conventional restraints had long been superfluous as safeguards; life and character have stood the test; freedom has been taken, and used, as a sacred right. These women resented the old absurd conventions in much the same spirit as a respectable and law-abiding citizen would resent being shadowed by a policeman; and self-control and their own perceptions have continued to do for them what the old rigid limitations were supposed to do.

But what about the other class, much the more numerous, that vast number of women for whom we are almost inclined to wish that a return to the former state of things were possible; whose only idea of liberty is freedom from all control, even that of their own reason and common-sense, and whose self-esteem is confined to an exaggerated esteem of their own personal attractions?

The writer remembers reading, many years ago, a charming little literary monograph upon Tennyson's *Lady of Shalott*, by a then young writer, who is now dead. To him *The Lady of Shalott* suggested the picture of a woman leading the conventional life. She, like the woman in the strange mystical poem, is in touch with nothing real, content to look at the world of human life, not at first hand, but by the reflections of a mirror: content to live in her island, guarded by those four grey walls and four grey towers, while the stream of life on the river and on the high road flows past her—so close and yet so infinitely far. But at last among those 'shadows of the world' she sees visions which make her 'half-sick of shadows,' and then comes the great awakening. She looks from the shadows to the realities, and is overwhelmed and carried away by their terrific inrush upon the unprepared soul.

Out flew the web and floated wide;
The mirror cracked from side to side;
'The curse is come upon me!' died
The Lady of Shalott.

This seems a wonderfully fine interpretation of the poem. The mirror, the island, the walls and towers—all these things were constraint, and at best a makeshift for the true and open outlook upon life, and the brave endeavour to play a worthy part in it. Still, the constraint was support as well as constraint. There certainly was a good deal of the prophetic in the slight suggestions.

But anyone who reasons in this strain must be quite prepared to have thrown at his head Macaulay's well-known prescription for the cure of the evils newly acquired freedom produces—viz. *liberty*. It needs some courage to argue against a dictum which history has so repeatedly justified, and, speaking generally, even the most careless and superficial student of either social or political history is forced to accept it as a great truth.

But in this case there seems to be another force at work, a form of social pressure, which at present, at any rate, appears to be falsifying the expectations of the prophets who so confidently forecast the lines upon which the natural evolution of woman might have been expected to proceed. And the most noticeable product of this force is a species of immodesty, of a type essentially new and modern. It is not pretended that the present age is conspicuous for the immodesty of a large class among Englishwomen; but whereas other periods have been notorious for the licence and immodesty of a class, at the present time this taint appears in every class, in sharp and immediate contrast with ideas of the most pure and elevated kind.

The position of women in regard to the stage is only one symptom of the evil; there are many others. The newspaper reports of actions for breach of promise to marry very often have the effect of sudden flash-lights, revealing things which may escape notice in the broad and general light of day. The morality of assuming a marriage engagement to be of the nature of a commercial contract, a breach of which is liable to be made the ground of legal proceedings, has often been questioned; but whatever one's opinion on that point may be, it is not too much to say that the sort of evidence which is usually brought paints a humiliating picture of the modern woman, and the way in which she regards marriage. It would scarcely be conceivable on ordinary testimony that there could be such a number of women willing and even eager to marry men who had shown themselves unwilling, and in many cases insultingly averse, to carry out what often proves to be a very loose and sometimes altogether imaginary contract. But the sworn verbal and written evidence puts the matter beyond dispute. It is, perhaps, scarcely fair to take these cases as typical of the manners and methods of the modern girl; but it must be pointed out that the cases are very numerous and the evidence almost always unpleasant reading, and these two facts in themselves illustrate the argument.

There is another glaring instance, which, however, one almost

hesitates to discuss. But it is impossible to be blind to the fact that the molestation of women, and particularly of young girls, in the streets is too often due to their own immodest and provocative behaviour. It is true, no doubt, that some part at least of their reckless levity is due to the fact that to natures of an adventurous and daring temperament the element of danger is fatally alluring. But altogether there is a most unhealthy sentiment on this subject among girls, even among girls whose behaviour and bearing are *not* of a sort to provoke insulting notice. Such episodes are not looked upon with the disgust and repugnance which they ought to inspire. How can a modest girl lightly and cheerfully relate to other women a story of insult to herself? And yet girls do tell these stories of being accosted in the streets, tell them with something of relish and gratified vanity. It is the strangest problem! That a well-bred, modest girl should feel anything except indignation and unspeakable shame at being mistaken for something she does feel the deepest disgust for—however much she may have learnt to pity it! That such lack of proper feeling may sometimes be due to ignorance is perhaps partly true; but any girl of decent bringing-up, however inexperienced and however ignorant of evil she may be, surely may be supposed to know that she ought to resent being familiarly addressed by a stranger; and if she does not know it, then she only forms a further illustration.

Have a sufficient number of instances been given? They are not easy to write about, and not pleasant to read about. But if there is truth in the charges, every observant and reflective person will be able to verify and amplify them by particular cases in his own experience, and will know actual instances of the extreme want of reserve, dignity, and self-respect, which is so largely characteristic of the girls of to-day.

The question may well be repeated, and seriously considered. And will the spread of education and consequent elevation of ideals among women lead to a cure of the evil? Will continued liberty cure the evils which have flowed from liberty? Is there anything to militate against an optimistic view?

For answer let the inquirer ask himself another question: this—‘Why do women and girls make themselves so cheap?’ The phrase is a colloquialism, but it is expressive of a special and particular meaning, which it would not be possible to convey exactly in any other words. The correct answer to the question would be ‘Because they are so cheap.’ In this great social fact lies the difficulty. From a variety of causes, women are in an enormous majority in this country, a majority which has been constantly on the increase for many years past. What wonder, then, if the old had idea of the mental and social inferiority of woman should have merged into a new and not less mischievous estimate of her superfluity in the social machine?

One does not need to be so very old in order to remember something of the startled air with which women awoke to the fact that men no longer sought their companionship, or looked upon it as a privilege. At first this was resented, but gradually women have come to silently accept the position. Some of them, that is; the others—well, if the mountain will not come to Mahomet, that is not to say there is an impassable gulf between the mountain and the prophet.

To impress society with a due sense of the importance of the average woman certainly requires more dignity and more self-esteem than the average woman generally possesses. Families where there are troops of girls are simply anathema to the unfortunate hostess upon whom they have claims. We have all heard her groans over the difficulty of securing equal numbers of men and women for her dances, Bridge parties, and, indeed, for every social function where men and women meet. Socially, the men are always at a premium and the women at a discount. A man, provided only that he has some pretensions to the necessary social standing, with nothing in the way of cleverness, or attainments, or good looks to recommend him, has a value which is intrinsic—he is a man, and will outweigh the social attractions of at least two women who have everything else which he lacks.

But the way this disproportion of the sexes affects the marriage question is much more serious. A man may remark on his intention to marry at some indefinite future time, when prudence or other considerations may make it possible or advisable, without having, as a rule, to run the gauntlet of a chorus of impertinent and stupid would-be witty remarks. But, should a girl be bold enough, or, rather, natural and simple enough, to say the same thing, what would be the result? Why, everyone knows that she would be promptly sneered out of countenance. And why? Is it immodest for a woman to express a determination to enter into a state which we are being continually reminded is a natural and honourable state, while it is modest and proper for a man to do so? Such a distinction would never be drawn except for the 'cheapness' to which reference has been made. If a man wants to marry he can marry; if the first woman he asks refuses him, he has only to ask a second, or perhaps a third or fourth. It would be safe to guarantee that within a month any man of fairly respectable life and position and appearance who cared to make the experiment could marry in his own class, could marry probably a woman much superior to himself. But what about the girl who intends to marry 'some day'? Is she not in a very different position from the man? Here is a girl of good character—much better than the man's, probably—average intelligence, average good looks. Theoretically she is free to marry whom she will; but is she? If she receives one distinct offer of marriage she has had more than her share, according to the probable

average. The fact that, by an unwritten law, a woman must not take, and indeed does not want to take, the initiative, has very little to do with the extremely limited choice which modern conditions impose upon Englishwomen.

Contrast the estimate of woman's social importance here with that which prevails in the newer countries, where women are not in the majority, but in the minority. Certainly it would seem that any disturbance of the normal balance is attended by more or less of social evil. But though we have heard something of the mischievous effects upon the modesty of women in communities where they are in the minority, it appears clear that an immodesty which proceeds from a low estimate of woman's dignity and importance must be worse and more degrading to the whole community than the sort which arises from an exaggerated estimate. Let anyone who doubts this carefully observe the reckless conduct, language, and bearing of the girls of the present day in their social intercourse with men. There has always been a type of woman who has been ready to sacrifice everything she ought to hold sacred for the sake of 'a good marriage.' There is now a type in every class, but more particularly in the lower and middle classes, which will sacrifice all for *marriage*.

The facts from the standpoint of which these observations have been made are beyond dispute, and must be admitted and met in any attempt to counteract the evil conditions for which they are so largely accountable. Also, they can no more be altered than ignored, so far as it is possible to see at present. Counteractions and palliations there may be, however. •

There has been during the last twenty or thirty years a strong and growing determination to educate girls in such a manner that in the matter of livelihood they shall be independent of marriage. One may notice, though, that the possibility of a girl remaining single is generally put down to any cause rather than to the principal one. We are reminded that the standard of living has risen so much higher that people are afraid to face married life on the extremely limited incomes their fathers and mothers began upon; that girls now are able to earn their own living, and prefer to remain single; that the conveniences of life in cities have made it possible for men to obtain comfort and relaxation which thirty years ago they could only obtain in their own homes. All this is true, but is not the whole truth; not one of these is even the principal reason why one can count so many unmarried women among one's acquaintance. But the undisputed fact remains, and in the circumstances of the case the modern idea of the education of girls is a piece of practical wisdom. Only the reformers have not gone far enough—they have not even *seen* far enough. It is a general charge against social reformers that their ideals are too high, too far-reaching, and only serve to discourage and alarm more moderate and more timid

souls. Well, at last the reformers are avenged in some measure. Here is a case of ideals realised; but the ideals are not high enough, and the present case of the realised reform is a deplorable failure to grapple with an important part of the problem. A new adjustment of ideals is necessary. Parents and educationalists have contented themselves with making girls independent of marriage in a *material* sense, as if that were all that was necessary to ensure their happiness and well-being. But they have quite overlooked the most necessary thing. The girl is still taught that marriage is her proper sphere—so it is—but the point is made of far too much importance, and is emphasised and pressed too much. Marriage is man's proper sphere also, but it is not considered necessary to insist upon it all the time, and with such vehemence.

Those who have the training of boys wisely aim at the highest possible development both in body and mind of the *human being*; the practice often falls short of the ideal, but that is the ideal. Now, what is the aim in the training of girls? To make them as perfect *women* as possible; not as perfect human beings as possible, but as perfect women. The idea of sex is never lost sight of, a method of education which would be positively dangerous in the case of boys, and which is only saved from the full consequences of its foolishness by the better moral nature and less strongly developed animal passions of girls. But still the girl grows up, having learnt to look at everything from the woman's standpoint, not from the larger standpoint of humanity. She never loses the consciousness of sex; it colours all her ideas; and probably in this fact lies the solution of the mystery that men are so often utterly baffled when they try to understand women. How can they possibly expect to do so? Men use their trained human intelligence and are not all the time looking at questions and events as male creatures. They forget that women, broadly speaking, are only using half their consciousness, the other half, the very one which would be common ground between them, being stunted or dormant. The emotional side of woman's nature is already strong, quite enough so for her own happiness; then why, in the name of all that is reasonable, foster it and cultivate it until it overpowers the intellectual and critical side? Better far to teach her that she ought to have more than one outlook upon life, that she ought not to stake all her chances of happiness on the satisfaction of one part of her nature, on the always risky speculation of marriage. It has often been said that marriage means much more to a woman than to a man; that marriage is a woman's whole life, while it is only an incident in the life of a man. This is of course the extreme view, but there is much truth in it: truth, that is, as a matter of observation of actual life, but wholly false as an ideal. Marriage ought to be much more than an incident in a man's life; but, on the other hand, it ought not to be the whole of a woman's

life. Certainly this view has generally been urged upon women by men—it has suited their convenience—and women are always only too ready to believe what men tell them.

The great century whose record is now for ever closed will live in history as the birth-century of many great ideas, but none will be more important to the future of the world than this: that in this century God has chosen to reveal new and great truths to women, direct to women. In other ages women have helped in the great world-movements, and have done noble service for the causes of truth and righteousness. But they have followed men, followed them in truth and followed them in error. Great women have led—Joan of Arc led—but they have been the few brilliant and solitary exceptions, they have utterly failed to inspire and to lead other women. A marvellous change has come; women can lead, and women can lead other women as well as men. They are just as likely to lead both men and women into error as are the men leaders, but there is now this guarantee of safety: the world will never again listen to the voice of one half of mankind, while the other half is dumb on every question of social, national, and international importance.

But do the women leaders altogether realise that the struggle is not ended, that it has only begun? Women have won for women in an incredibly short time, when compared with the measure of the victory, a large and broad freedom. Freedom, however, is not the end, it is only the beginning: It is a vantage-ground, a sure foundation, upon which all strength and beauty may stand secure. Already the more intellectual and clear-sighted women have discovered that personality is a greater power than convention, and that the soil of freedom is favourable to its growth and development. And it is conceivable that the remarkable sweeping away of the old safeguards, however chaotic may appear the state of things at present, is only a symptom of the coming of a time when all human life shall be purer, yet freer, and when women shall rely, not as they do now, upon their weakness, but upon their strength.

Meanwhile a note of warning may well be sounded. There is a distinct danger that, in their haste to realise their own really high and noble conceptions, these strong ones may commit a great wrong against the weak. Safeguards are for the defence of the weak, and the strong have no right to sweep them down just because they themselves can do without them. And probably the great work which, in the new century, lies before the women who are passionately desirous of seeing the dreams of the old century for the inspiring and uplifting of their own sex become accomplished facts will be less in the direction of demanding more liberty, and more in the direction of helping the great uncultured, unaspiring, dead-level mass of women to use liberty heroically, to teach them to estimate

themselves at their true value, to help them to cultivate to the very utmost every power of soul, mind, and body, in the sure conviction that life—life itself—of which marriage is only a condition, even though the most important condition—holds more than enough of wonder, and interest, and work, and play, and high exalted purpose, to fill and overflow it, as long as love and reason shall illuminate it.

HARRIETT E. MAHOOD.

EMIGRATION FOR GENTLEWOMEN

FAMILIAR as I am with the actual conditions of colonial life, and the terrible competition for work amongst women of the cultured classes at home, it has always been a surprise to me that a system of emigration for ladies, very much more thorough and widespread than any now in existence, has not been adopted before this. Apart from fifty other considerations, it is a sin against the Gospel of Political Economy—which gospel, I am told, cannot err. For if there is one demand which is loud and unequivocal, it is the demand for the Englishwoman's help in our colonies, in certain parts of the United States, and indeed in all parts of the world now being colonised by our countrymen. And if there is one instance of there being no supply in response to the demand, it is this instance—the failure of women to answer the call to fields of useful work and a potential sphere of happiness in the new countries of the world.

Although it may seem surprising that in a great colonial empire no widespread or thorough system of inter-emigration for young women of education and energy should exist, it is scarcely astonishing that these young women do not come forward individually to respond to a demand which cannot but be known to them. Obvious indeed are the difficulties which lie between the home here in England and the home there in the colonies. In the first place, perhaps, the fitting diffidence of woman has checked so assertive and unusual an act as an independent emigration to a strange country and a new. Many have gone out with relatives and friends, or under the auspices of the one or two societies which have been so sensible as to make this their business; yet they are but a tithe of those who are wanted, for whom a 'berth' and a hearty welcome are waiting if they will but go.

Another and an equally serious difficulty to many of those who would be willing as well as glad to go, is the consciousness of their lacking the suitable talents to take with them. Some are governesses; some are bred to nursing; others, again, are in a certain degree specialists in the departments of music, or embroidery, or painting, or typewriting, or what not. They are rightly conscious that specialisation is as rarely required in a new country as it is

commonly demanded in an old. Still a further difficulty arises when the girl is ready enough, able enough, and as prepared as (without experience) she can hope to be, for there are thousands of women who do not know how to set about emigrating and are entirely ignorant of such means as already exist to help them. The chaperonage question, too, looms large here as elsewhere in life.

Since my knowledge of colonial life tells me that in emigration these thousands of girls would obtain a material improvement in their circumstances, and turn the possibility here in England of their having a happy home of their own to something even more than a probability in the colonies—even to a certainty, should they so choose—and since I am also of opinion that such an end can be reached by co-operative as well as individual means, I now hope to show that there really are ways out of the obvious difficulties of the matter. But these difficulties are real, all the same. For in the first place there is the natural sexual diffidence of the young woman to start out alone on a venture to a new life. I grant that this is a great difficulty, for sentimental as well as social and material reasons. For here we have our heartstrings tugging against us and drawing us to the old home. But the more practical difficulty lies in the absence of an answer to the questions 'How do I know that I shall obtain work?' and 'To whom shall I go?' I have a remedy for this, and I will deal with it later on. But it will be of use now to point out that when a girl knows the district to which she is going, and knows that somewhere in that district work is awaiting her, the main material obstacle has been overridden.

In the second place, then, I have to deal with those who do not at present possess the special talent for colonial life, or are unaware what that talent is. I will try to define the talent for them. It seems to me that the secret of a woman's success in any colony lies simply in her ability to make a home happy and comfortable—not a home such as she may have inhabited here, but a home where she must be a Jill-of-all-trades, if, alas, it involves her being mistress of none! Do I prescribe domestic work as the special field in the colonies for woman? I do; and I speak as one who knows. There is room for a few governesses, room for many nurses, room for a few typewriters; but in a country where, outside the few large towns, the people are very much scattered and spread, it has been found that a governess and a typewriter have little opportunity to earn their bread unless they add to their functions the everyday tasks of domestic life. In every colony there are hundreds of married women, most of them of gentle nurture, who are breaking down with the work of their homes—work which would be comparatively light had they been prepared to do it, methodically or not. But there are thousands of married women, good as well as indifferent housekeepers, who would welcome to their farms and their ranches a

healthy amiable woman, educated somewhat, able to cook and clean, sew and mend; and who would give that woman a free and pleasant home and put 50*l.* a year in her pocket in addition. Let there be no mistake: labour in the colonies is at the present moment in a bad condition for the employers. You have to pay atrociously high wages for a miserable servant, who has vulgar notions of what are her rights and her duties, who cares nothing for your comfort or your welfare, who will not do any work which is distasteful to her, and who leaves you at a moment's notice. Yet you have to pay this woman very large wages. If she be white (and the white servant in many places is not only the worst but the least pleasant to get on with), you pay her anything almost that she may choose to demand; and if she be a half-caste or full-blooded native some 30*l.* to 40*l.*, according to the locality, is what she will not only demand but be readily given.

Now, does it not seem clear that here lies a void which thousands of young Englishwomen of the better sort ought to be able to fill without serious difficulty? Is it not plain that there exists a need for them? One word, however, before I say something about the supply. The lot of a woman who goes as 'help' is in nearly every instance a distinctly happy one; for she is regarded, should she have sufficient self-respect to make herself respected and can thus dispense with silly conventional affectations, as an equal, as a friend, as a member of the family. In return for valuable assistance, she is paid an equivalent in victuals and money. The bargain is not one-sided: it is a fair bargain, and both are equal parties to it. In fact, a superior self-respecting woman is so much a member of the family that I may liken her position to that of a near relative, even a sister, of the mistress. She shares in the reception of the neighbours who ride and drive over from time to time; she is included in their invitation to make a return visit. There is no snobbery about her working for her living where every one is obviously doing the same. Within the limitations imposed by her duties and the convenience of the family, she comes and goes with freedom: she is, I repeat, one of the family, and a recognised unit in the society of the neighbourhood.

Here, then, we have the return she receives for her help, and we must now consider the character of the help she has to supply. Well, it is all-round work: hard work (though not without intermission or pleasantness) in the home. First there is cooking—and in the colonies you do not have the raw material of your cooking nicely prepared for you. As often as not, if she wants a fowl from the yard she must go out and kill it (though, with men about, a little foresight on her part will prevent this, should she greatly object), and certainly she must draw and clean and truss it. Then, unless she has been so wise as to cultivate a little patch of herbs outside the

kitchen door—and this is work she can well do—she has to cook bird or beast in a tasty way as best she can. All food should be tasty; and I know from personal experience that not all colonial cookery is calculated to make one eat with that gusto which helps to health. One must have resource—to be able almost to make a beef-steak out of mutton scraps! Any one will understand what I mean—when you are twenty miles from a shop, you have often to rely on dodges and makeshifts of your own, and it is well to know something of these dodges before you are brought face to face with the pressing need for them. Now, if a girl contemplates colonial life and cannot cook—it is of course of the utmost importance that she should be able to cook—she must either start at once learning at home, which is the best training, though difficult to pursue honestly and tending to become desultory, or she must attend some of the classes in simple cookery which are now so commonly held by the county councils and other bodies engaged in technical education. Mind, it must first of all be *simple* cookery, which is nothing like so simple as its name; and then it would be well to learn a few things that may or may not be included in the course—such as tasty hashes, *réchauffés* generally, omelets, curries, pastry, and the preserving of fruit and vegetables.

After cooking come scrubbing, cleaning, washing, and general housework. This may sound dismal to some. Believe me, it is only the sound. In a happy home, under the fresh and healthy conditions of farm or ranche life, this work becomes positively pleasant. And though this is no argument, I have washed my own shirt and stockings before now and hung them to dry from my stirrups as I rode along, and experienced keen satisfaction—as well as comfort—from the act! And this work, though it comes day after day and week after week, does not entail so long a preparation as cooking. Still, every young woman should be well up in the fundamentals of housework and particularly good at washing flannel and stuffs, as well as light flimsy fabrics, before she contemplated, say, South Africa or Queensland. After these first essentials come many ‘desirables;’ but these may be left to the individual taste and the common measure of sense, though I would add that to be able to ride is very useful. It can be learned quickly enough when you get out, but I put this question to the woman who has delayed until then: ‘How would you like to have to ride some seventy miles up through lush country to your first billet?’ For as likely as not she may be called upon to do it.

Again, women are usually ignorant of the conditions of colonial life, and therefore unable to judge of their ability to lead it. In regard to this, I would say that, roughly, the work of a small farmer’s wife in this country is not very dissimilar to that of a woman in the colonies. There are several differences in the life, of course, and notably there is this important difference—that a woman of gentle nurture would have no difficulty in finding in the colonies a society

of men and women of similar antecedents, though their work might appear to be that of a lower social scale ; but, roughly, the conditions of the working life are much the same, and any country girl should know what this means. It is obvious, by the way, that if a woman is living in the country in England and can therefore seize the opportunity, the art of milking and of making butter would be most valuable to her in after-life. A good milker is rare indeed among 'new chums' in the colonies, and if a woman could add milking to her domestic achievements, she would be a very valuable and popular person. But there are plenty of women living in towns who are therefore deprived of these opportunities of observing what their life will be. Books will help them a little, and to them I say : Read all the books describing colonial life that you can, and especially read books describing life in that colony or country to which you wish to go. It matters not if the book be by a man or a woman, although a woman is more likely to dwell on the domestic side. For South Africa, for example, I know no better book than *Home Life on an Ostrich Farm*, by Mrs. Martin, which gives an admirable account of South African living generally. And, after all, it is not so much the principles as the application of the principles of domestic work which vary with the country and the climate. A good housewife in England will be a good housewife in Canada or West Australia. But books, though good, are not enough for any one, least of all for those who are ignorant of the very terms and phrases of country life. Therefore, for them it is imperative that they should spend three months at least—board, residence, and all-round activity—at a small farm in the country.

And now comes the practical point—the act of emigration itself. And I do not forget that I also have to answer the questions 'How do I know that I shall obtain work?' and 'To whom shall I go?' Well, I candidly confess that here perhaps is the greatest difficulty when we come to consider the emigration of women on a wholesale basis. The two or three societies that help on this work are not doing one quarter of what might be done, and it is obviously insufficient, though excellent as far as it goes, to trust to relatives and friends who may have broken already the ice of emigration. Of this I will speak later, as it is very important. But if the woman has no relatives successfully colonising, it becomes necessary to obtain from the different societies full information as to the existing state of the labour market in the various colonial fields, and, what is better, good and reliable introductions. These societies may get her an assurance of work before even she leaves England—but they may not ; and when she reaches the colonies she finds their organisation often weak and generally uncertain. Still, they have helped many women to find good work, and, in the absence of better at present, their aid is useful.

Only the other day Mr. Joseph Chamberlain presided over the annual meeting of one of these societies—the United British Women's Emigration Association—whose headquarters, appropriately enough, are at the Imperial Institute. There was a great gathering of men and women interested in woman's lot and the upbuilding of the social fabric of our colonies. But all the speakers appeared to confine themselves to the servant class, and no one seemed to have a thought for the active, able, plucky, and resourceful gentlewoman. And the work of this, perhaps the most important of our women's emigration societies, is small enough—scarcely 400 women were helped last year to make a start in a new country. And of these, few appear to have been of the class and destined to the work for which I plead. This, in fact, seems the tendency of all the societies. They deal almost exclusively with women of the servant class; they are purely philanthropic bodies, in which a highly centralised system and the lady patroness are greatly in evidence. The movement is not run on business lines, as it well might be; nor are its operations sufficiently decentralised to secure that support and sympathy from our colonial cousins which are essential to complete success.

I may mention, in passing, that among the societies which devote the whole, or a part of their energies to this work—confined as it is mainly to the servant class—are the Girls' Friendly Society, the Young Women's Christian Association, the S.P.C.K., the Church Emigration Society, the Self-Help Emigration Society, and the Colonial Nursing Association. There is, however, one society—the Female Middle-class Emigration Society—which will make loans to women who can guarantee the repayment of such loans within a period of two years; and, in my opinion, this society, the United British Women's Emigration Association (what a name!), and the National Union of Women-Workers might evolve between them a wide-reaching practical working scheme on the lines of this article, which should prove a great and immediate success.

There are many weak points in these undeveloped emigration societies. They are not sufficiently 'mutual.' They do not continue to operate through those they have helped to good homes and happy work in the colonies. The aim of such a society should be to enable single or widowed women of the better class to emigrate to the colonies and elsewhere with a distinct assurance of the work they are willing to undertake. The methods of the societies should include the quarterly issue of bulletins containing the most recent information on the areas of labour; and particularly should the societies make an agent of every person who goes out through it, and regard her as morally responsible for future help to the society. Every person sent out should thus become a correspondent of the society, or of its branch in each colonial capital, and inform it of the 'berths' vacant or likely to be created in her immediate district.

To the good offices of this correspondent any woman sent out to her district would be consigned. Berths could in many cases be filled direct from England, or by the branch in the colonial capital on the arrival of the emigrant, or, in some cases, by correspondents inviting a woman from one district into another. *Every* woman sent out should become a correspondent, for not only would it be unfair but impossible to expect that one hard-working woman could think or write about all the working women and the situations in her district. Thus by widespread communications and by this act of friendliness it would be possible to keep in close and even confidential touch with thousands of farms and ranches where healthy, amiable, and, in a real sense, superior women are 'in great request.' The quarterly bulletins might reasonably and most usefully contain the names and addresses of correspondents in the different districts. To connect the organisation and complete the system an experienced person should visit and report on the more important districts in her own colony every year, and she would probably return with a long list of billets ready and waiting for the right woman.

Clearly, then, a great deal can be done by a wide-awake and practical woman's society which has nothing of the 'charitable' about it and works on a fair commission basis. But I do not forget that our national temperament is not bureaucratic, and that especially amongst the class I have in mind—the cultured, well-bred, but poor—the work of any society is prone to be difficult, if not inoperative. For numbers of English ladies, then, I turn to another means—one which my personal experience leads me to believe is able to do a very large amount of good for healthy, vigorous, unemployed or ill-employed Englishwomen.

I allude to the brothers who have gone out in their thousands to all parts of the world, and are leading, many of them, a successful and happy life under essentially colonial conditions. That they often do this in spite of extraordinary domestic difficulties is obvious to any one familiar with their lives; yet many of us at home, even the very parents of these hardy young fellows, seem to be fearfully ignorant of the rude, even barbarous domesticity which envelops their boys. Let me, for example, take cooking. I have stayed with young men in the colonies who did their own cooking. Well, I would rather draw a veil—or shall I say a dish-cloth?—over the bulk of it. The most marvellous concoctions are prepared with profound labour and an enormous expenditure of time—which only appetites produced by healthy work and sharpened not a little by suspense could possibly assimilate. And great waste results from incapacity to make that old, old friend the 'resurrection-pie,' though 'dry-hash' and 'dandy-funk' are sometimes achieved. Then take bread. The specific gravity of the gentleman-baker's bread is very, very great. It cannot be to the advantage of the young man's health

that he should provide for himself a course of this cookery, month in and month out, the year round. I do not linger on the 'washing-up' (on Sundays or when the entire stock of crockery is exhausted), nor on the needlework. Buttons may be overcome by the use of large needles with eyes open wide for the threading, but darning and patching are clearly lost arts on many a colonial farm. As to the scrubbing of floors, I have seen little in such bachelor homes—though scraping is sometimes tried. As a whole, the house is absolutely unhomelike. And, generally speaking, the decently bred and passably educated young Englishman who enters on colonial life to 'batch' by himself, descends from a high level of comfort and refinement to a low level of degradation and disorder. He passes swiftly from the decent Englishman to the dishevelled savage. It is not because he desires to do this—all the time he is loathing it; but what cooks and housemaids and gardeners did for him in the old country, unnoticed and unappraised, he has got to do for himself in the new. And he simply does not know how it is to be done. Even if he did, the domestic tendency is not his, and the domestic habit he has never acquired: his main work, too, lies outside. So he drifts from bad to worse; and though a percentage are saved by hereditary virtues and personal pluck, the majority drift as failures to the town, and become units of that floating unemployed population which no one—least of all a new country—needs or desires.

The reason of this large percentage of failures is, in my opinion, the absence of the *home*. In nearly every enterprise possible in an essentially agricultural and colonial life, the work emanates from and gravitates round the fact of the homestead. After all, the unit of colonial expansion is the home. Its civilising and social power is not to be magnified. It neutralises the depression of solitary life and effort—too often responsible for failure. Every one who knows anything about the colonies knows that two men in living and working partnership get on better than when living and working apart. It is true that when success is attained, separate and conflicting interests often enough determine the partnership; but the early days of inevitable struggle form the crux of colonial life, and these have been successfully grappled with by united hands, united sympathies, united interests, and a common as opposed to a solitary life.

Now, if a brother and sister have more or less common affinities, and the girl is active, healthy, even-tempered, and not afraid of work, there lies between them a great chance of a successful colonial career. The material value of a helpful woman in the house is itself great. You can generally—I am almost inclined to say you can *always*—tell, in the colonies, if a house has a mistress before ever you set foot indoors. She cares for the fabric of the home; she effectively does the housework; she looks after the tiny garden with blooming

result; she manages the poultry, and thus creates a new resource; she is even responsible for most of the dairying. Of course it is all on a small scale, and the standard of life is simplicity itself, or the work would be beyond any one person's power; but she can do it, and she does it, and thus enables the man to plough and care for his cattle, and carry on the sterner duties of the homestead. But it is not merely her material value which makes such a difference. There is the moral and social value, and that is almost beyond exaggeration. It is of the very highest importance in a life which is often lonely, frequently hard, sometimes unfortunate, and always likely, when lived alone, to bring diffidence, distrust, and failure. Therefore I should like some one to suggest to the thousands of young Englishmen who annually leave this country for a distant colony, that it would be for their general good—and a very material contribution to their own chances of success—if after they had spent the first year in the new country they could send for the sister they get on with best, and who is at the same time most fitted for plucky work, and enter into partnership with her for a given time.

For there should be this element of business in the arrangement. The woman is worth as much as the man in a life like this. She is a material factor in the production of profit, in the creation of resources, in the husbanding of cash outlay. She is an equal partner, in my opinion, as far as labour is concerned; and in families where capital is scarce, and such as exists is often tied up for the 'helpless females,' the addition of her share to the modest sum given to the young fellow when starting for the colonies is a great consideration in the problem. Brother and sister, it seems to me, should take up a farm together and work it on terms of equal partnership for, if possible, not less than four or five years. The time will come, in all probability, when one or the other or both will want to marry, and it is only right and practical that then there should be a basis for the equitable division of, or allowance for, the results of their joint labours. Such a practical treatment of the matter tends naturally to create out of a common interest a mutual forbearance and respect—valuable things in working lives.

Of course the details vary with the cases. If the man is young—a lad of twenty—it is preferable that an older rather than a younger sister should follow him out in the succeeding year. Health, vigour, a settled constitution and a tendency to the life are all important to her. Both parties should be left unfettered in the settlement of the bargain. It is for their own benefit or their own undoing that they make the enterprise. Yet, given a little capital, a free homestead (obtainable in all colonies), a native energy, and an average endowment of English pluck, the chances are all in favour of success and happiness. She must not expect a mirror of English country life; but she will find hearty kindness, true welcome, and many pleasant-

newer. She must not think she can be comfortable in a country unless she is ready to adopt its ways; but the ways, though different, are at bottom the ways of her countrywomen, and the same fundamental ideas and moral influences are observed and respected. Rough will her little home seem at first; let her bring out all the knick-knacks and everything which makes for pleasure or use that she may possess. They will help to make that new home but an offspring of the old, and lighten it greatly in the days that are dark. But the greatest resource and reward of all will be the knowledge that she is living a busy useful life, that hers is a full life with no years of hollow idleness or hopeless cheerless work, and that she is moving on, step by step, to a financial independence which will place her far above those helpless girls of her own generation in the old country, who have weathered the brightest days of their age, and year by year have become more and more hopelessly dependent on others.

And this is no mere scheme or armchair Utopia; for it is simply descriptive of accomplished facts—of conditions and possibilities I have seen worked out practically in colonial life. But it is the rareness with which one meets it abroad and the ignorance of it which one finds at home that create the necessity for a public insistence upon it.

Thus I have shown that there are at least two ways for the woman emigrant to take—the one leading her to assured work and welcome in the house of employers who regard no honest work as menial and who share in it equally with herself, while they look upon her as one of themselves; and the other, which leads her, when circumstances render it possible, to a renewal of the old home life, with her own kith and kin, in the new country, and carries her forward to a financial and personal independence unattainable here by her work. And so I suggest that a great number of Englishwomen—not too old to adapt themselves to the new conditions of colonial life—should fit themselves for these conditions and make use of the opportunities at their elbows. Many a charming outlook is lost for want of an open window: I have opened a window on a life for all who can make themselves useful and agreeable—a life which will pay them well for their work and enable them to save up something more than a 'nest-egg' against the advancing years; a life which will preserve and improve their health; which has advantages impossible for many thousands to obtain here; which offers opportunities of future independence which cannot occur in any overcrowded country; and last, though not least, a life where the chances of a happy, comfortable and mutually helpful marriage—for woman is ineradicably primitive, thank goodness!—are immeasurably greater than they are in England.

ARTHUR MONTEFIORE BRICE.

DOCTORS IN HOSPITALS

THE sense of the nation has willed that the chief portion of the active medical and surgical treatment of the sick and injured poor and all the work of training students of medicine and surgery shall be carried out in hospitals established and maintained by private effort, and owing nothing either to the State or the parish. The most valuable of these hospitals have been founded by laymen, and some few have been endowed by the founders or other lay benefactors, but more commonly they are supported by the voluntary subscriptions and casual gifts of charitable individuals.

To the superficial observer the complicated administration of a great hospital appears, doubtless, to work smoothly; but we may take for granted that the managers are never permitted to lose sight for long of the possibility of friction. Two essentially conflicting influences are always present, the philanthropic and the professional. When considering the work of these institutions, people usually start with serious misconceptions. They suppose the aims of the medical and lay workers to be identical, that both parties are engaged upon a purely benevolent object; and seeing that in most instances the doctors and surgeons perform their all-important duties without direct remuneration it is assumed that hospitals have been placed under obligations to the profession so heavy as to represent a permanent charge upon their independence.

This view of the position occupied by the medical staff, fostered as it is by the professional press, enforced by the attitude of the members of the staff—who announce themselves as the largest contributors to the hospital—and accepted without inquiry by a majority of people, produces mischievous consequences. It is in a large degree responsible for the difficulties and shortcomings of hospital government, and for the absence of the strict discipline which in an army of workers ought to be regarded as indispensable. It leads the members of the staff not only to assert the liberty to do or to leave undone, which is the bane of honorarism, and becomes dangerous in the precise ratio of the importance of the duties undertaken, but it leads also to the inconsistent demand for something like a return in kind for services rendered, and thus raises the

question whether the hospitals are primarily for the benefit of the poor or the profession.

Those who have blindly adopted the notion that the hospitals are 'in pawn' will be startled by the proposition that, so far from the hospitals being indebted to the profession, the obligation the profession owes to them is immeasurably greater. From the day when as a freshman he enters the hospital school, on through the several phases of his career, up to the time when he ceases to practise, the physician or surgeon goes on adding to the debt he has incurred. The hospital brought him into being; it has furnished him with knowledge, and taught him how to make practical use of that knowledge; it has given him his hall-mark, and he goes forth to the battle of life equipped with weapons forged and kept serviceable in the hospital armoury. Or, if he should have sought and obtained a coveted position upon the staff, the hospital ratifies his ambition to take rank as a consultant; and by the bold advertisement a post about a great hospital confers, it helps him upwards to fortune and to fame. This fact is so well recognised that at the time of the establishment of a certain hospital a physician of repute offered a donation of a thousand guineas in return for an appointment upon the staff.

Upon the other hand, the members of the lay board who bring their energies and oftentimes their money to the service of the hospital, and not seldom devote to it as much, and even more, time than the members of the medical staff, have no reward but the satisfaction which comes of taking part in a good work. Usually, although in their own circles and beyond them they may be men of mark and leading, their names are unknown in connection with the hospital whose affairs they administer, and amid the polemics of a recent conflict it has happened that they have been described by one medical authority as merely negligible quantities, and by another as being at most 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.' The medical staff at the same time claim and are duly credited with having performed 'all the real work.'

It is easy to follow the logical effect of this attitude of mind upon a controversy concerning the methods of hospital management. To those who believe that all the real work is performed by the staff, and that the laymen are but humble serving-men, it must appear only natural and reasonable that the control of the institution should be in the hands of the doctors and surgeons. There is nothing new in the contention that a medical institution should be 'medical through-out.' The pronouncement is convincing not only to those who believe that a hospital is medical and nothing more, but it satisfies the many people whose range of vision is limited to what lies uppermost. Obviously, if medical men and medical work occupy the whole fabric, there is no room for anyone else, and it is absurd for

laymen to attempt to maintain a footing. There is, however, this drawback to so simple and summary a conclusion. The lay element in the hospital structure is there already; it always has been there, and that it should remain there is a prime necessity. It is not the uppermost storey of the edifice, reaching far into space and compelling observation; but it forms the foundation, and it cannot be eliminated or weakened without a catastrophe.

The lay workers are content to carry on their labours out of sight, and they are not less disposed to accord, than the medical workers are to demand, the post of honour. The exiguous ambition of a hospital lay worker is easily satisfied; he is content to help forward the work for its own sake, and to rejoice over honours won by others from the opportunities which he and the class he represents have provided. Put briefly, all that the layman asks is that the professional and educational side of the work shall be kept subordinate to the benevolent. But although he asks no more than this, his demand involves not only the philanthropic reputation of the hospital, but its very existence, because it is certain that a hospital surrendered to professional domination would quickly lose the confidence both of its supporters and of its patients.

There are, then, two definite propositions to maintain: first, that the hospitals have in no wise bartered their independence to the profession, which with the patients and the public takes its full share of their benefits; and secondly, that the interests of the patients demand that the government of hospitals shall be in the hands of laymen.

When we come to examine into the means, needs, and work of the hospitals, we are confronted at the outset by the serious fact that, except in those few cases where an endowment has been provided, there is, beyond the need of arranging for a competent administration of affairs and for carrying out the technical work of treatment, a pressing and ever-present problem—how to obtain the means of subsistence and to provide for the developments and enlargements from time to time called for. Especially is this the case with the hospitals of London, which, owing to the extent and configuration of the town and the almost complete absence of local interest, can hope for support only if they succeed in keeping their necessities in the minds of the benevolent minority. A reputation for good work is not a sufficient passport to favour. A reputation merely scientific is a hindrance. Donors as a class are not willing to make their gifts in aid of research and medical education, though as a matter of fact considerable grants are made by many of the hospitals towards the support of the medical schools attached to them. It would be more reasonable that the schools should make grants to the hospitals. The so-called 'management' of a hospital therefore includes in nearly all cases the presentment in an attractive form of the work accomplished, an

ever-ready advocacy of its claims to support and the collection of funds. The formidable and exacting nature of the task can only be appreciated by those who have attempted it.

And this task lay workers have taken upon themselves. In a few instances and upon special occasions the medical staff may lend their aid in collection; but such financial help, considered relatively, is infinitesimal and without practical influence. It is a curious fact, from which more than one interesting supposition might be gathered, that, while lay workers not uncommonly render substantial financial assistance to the institutions with which they are associated, the physicians and surgeons, many of whom amass great wealth, rarely assist during life or make bequests at death. The laity therefore stand in the position of proprietors. It is they who have furnished the capitals sunk in the land, buildings, and equipment of the hospitals; it is they who, by their labours, their gifts, and their bequests, enable the expenditure to be met.

The medical staff enter in and enjoy. It is true that they bring to the hospital wares without which all the labours of the laity would be futile, and the hospital a mere asylum or lazaret-house; but, after all has been said, this is only a repayment of the hospital's own. They are wares of which the hospital has provided alike the rough material, the instruments and appliances for its manipulation, the knowledge requisite to manipulate, and the market for the finished article. There is no portion of the institution to which the staff is not indebted. At first thought it might be suggested that the patients supply an exception. On the contrary, considered apart from individual instances where more than customary attention has been bestowed, the obligation as between the patients and members of the staff is at least mutual. A medical writer once upon a time stated that if patients failed to present themselves at the hospital in sufficient numbers, the schools would find it necessary to pay them to come. The argument could not be carried further. The assertion shows at a glance that hospitals and their patients are daily necessities for the staff and the school; and that if the supply failed, the profession must either take steps to obtain for itself what is now given without price, or perish of starvation.

It is supposed by some people that the time actually given by the staff to their hospital duties is an offering to benevolence, and may even involve the abandonment of remunerative engagements. But, beyond the fact that a visit to the hospital is rarely paid without something being gleaned for future use, neither hospital duties nor hospital ethics stand in the way of private practice. A junior is always at command by way of substitute, and attendance upon a private patient is rarely, if ever, declined because of hospital engagements. Again, the patronage of the hospital is very largely in the

keeping of its medical officers. They it is whose choice and recommendation govern all medical appointments, so that no one, however able, has any chance of election unless acceptable to his future colleagues. Two instances have been reported quite recently where medical committees have passed over an admittedly more eligible candidate for appointment upon the staff, and recommended one of inferior qualifications who was more acceptable to themselves. They it is who choose the patients for admission to the wards, and not unnaturally give preference to cases of professional interest which come in their way or to those introduced by their friends and clients. Upon the subject of investigatory work in hospitals and clinical teaching something will be said later. It is sufficient to remark here that while experimentalism, kept within proper limits, is not only legitimate but indispensable, if knowledge is to be maintained and enlarged, the fact that it is practised is inconsistent with the claim of the staff to be regarded as unremunerated workers. Lastly, in this connection, we must remember that the fees paid in private cases to a hospital physician or surgeon are enormous when compared with those obtainable by other members of the profession; and after making every allowance for his own individual excellence it is undeniable that his power to obtain them, and the demand for his services, are due to his connection with the hospital.

In dealing with the second proposition submitted—that the interests of the patients demand that the government of the hospital shall be in the hands of laymen—the considerations which arise are many and various. They help to demonstrate what is little more than a truism to those who are acquainted with the internal working of a medical institution, viz. how impassable is the gulf which divides the lay and medical minds, and how absolute is the severance of interests which to those who take a distant view may seem to run in the same channel. Few who are without experience of hospital life can form an idea of the lengths to which professional self-esteem is carried. To say that the medical mind is commonly exacting and unreasoning in its attitude towards laymen is to understate the case; it is arbitrary to a degree undreamed of by the uninformed. Seldom, if ever, is there an appreciative recognition of the lay side of the work. Usually it is despised; at best it is tolerated. Those who support the institution by their gifts are often regarded as the exponents of an amiable eccentricity—'imbecility' has been occasionally suggested—which in the circumstances is useful; but that they or their representatives should claim to take a serious or authoritative part in the affairs of the hospital is an unreasonable exercise of a doubtful prerogative.

From the moment a member of the visiting staff enters the building, until his carriage door closes upon him, he tacitly demands that everything and everybody shall give him place; and he moves

upon his way, receiving homage as he goes from a following of residents, clinical assistants, and students of various degrees. It is among the unpardonable sins that any person should enter a ward while he is there, raise a voice in his presence, or take notice of anything but what he desires shall be observed. Directly he appears upon the threshold all but those who attend him are expected instantly to withdraw, and the sister and nurses stand stricken until ordered into movement. The course of all things seems arrested; even suffering holds breath, and the ticking of the ward clock sounds profane in the sentient silence.

To the medical man of a certain class—the class which has been somewhat irreverently, but almost correctly, spoken of as the ‘hospital ring,’ all else in the world is subsidiary to medicine, and all men who are not medical are regarded as distinctly inferior to those who are. This idea finds almost continuous expression in the medical journals, where undiluted laudation of the profession is the stock commodity. These publications adopt an attitude of superior wisdom about everything they touch upon, and, while affecting judicial utterances, are never for a moment in doubt that their own view—that is, the medical view—is the right one. The thinkers who have avowed ‘medical tyranny’ to be one of the dangers of the future are less prophetic than perceptive. They have realised rather than foreseen; the evil already has a place among us. While the physician would regard as rank presumption the claim of a layman to possess, still more to utter, an opinion concerning the mental or bodily condition of any person before him, no matter how palpable and obvious, he betrays little difficulty about debating and even deciding the merits of a question legal, commercial, or financial. In all other professions it is not difficult to find men who can be trusted to do justice between one who is of their own cloth and one who is not, but the representative medical mind appears destitute of the quality of impartiality. Where is to be found a harder task than that of extracting the truth from an unwilling medical witness? When extracted, it is often so mangled and distorted as to be unrecognisable, or so smothered in the jargon of technicality that it has ceased to be vital.

In all likelihood there is scarcely a dispute upon record where the medical papers have taken the part of a layman as against a doctor; and no matter how personally hostile to one another members of the profession may be, they are always ready to combine against the stranger, while the actually fair-minded among them dare not cut the fetters which no ingenuity can slip and no pertinacity unfasten. This fact, if it stood alone, would constitute a most powerful argument against permitting medical influence to become supreme in institutions intended to be benevolent in their character.

We may ask, What is the object a man has in view when he seeks office upon a hospital staff? Some will say the object is philanthropic, and this view is sedulously put forward by medical writers. But it is absurd. There are other professions besides medicine which are of service to mankind, and would the members of any one of them claim that they are actuated solely by love of their fellows? That the physicians and surgeons of a hospital will do their best for the patients may be unreservedly admitted. So will a barrister for his client; but men who go to the Bar do not set forth with an intention to enforce a claim to philanthropy. Hospitals are schools of medicine; and it does not matter whether they are admittedly so, as all the larger ones are, or not. They are the founts of knowledge, and members of the staff draw from them as eagerly and to better purpose than the students. There is this difference, however. Every case is useful and knowledge-giving to the neophyte, but to members of the staff many of the cases present no features of interest, and they scarcely call for the serious attention of eminent savants. As a consequence, the tendency is to allot the beds in too great numbers to patients admitted less for their own benefit than for study, investigation, and manipulation. That is to say, the primary object of the hospital is made secondary, and a work intended by its supporters to be benevolent is carried on with a view to serve the educational and scientific aims of the profession. Physicians and surgeons are always indignant when this suggestion is put forward, but the evidence in support is simply overwhelming. In a letter published in a recent issue of a medical journal the writer (a medical man) says boldly: 'Those who carry on the medical work of hospitals do so for the reason that they supply wide fields for study and experiment, and are most important as a means of advertisement.' Nothing could be less equivocal. The laymen and laywomen who, in ignorance of facts and with a pious confidence in the benevolent aims of the profession, are disposed to make light of the necessity for retaining and strengthening the lay control of hospitals may with advantage ponder upon this pronouncement and determine its import.

It has been alleged, and the argument is not ineffective, that the presence of students helps to maintain in the staff a high standard of diligence and efficiency. The work, it is said, is carried on under observation so close and unremitting that the physician or surgeon dares not be lax either in diagnosis or treatment, and so lose the confidence of those to whom in the future he will look to supply his consulting-room with patients. But this is only a part of the case. The dominant fact is that the teacher looks to provide interesting subjects for his class, and not less for himself. Professionally regarded, the ideal hospital patient is commonly one for whose benefit perhaps little or nothing can be done, but whose condition

affords opportunity for clinical instruction, the elucidation of theory, or for carrying out a brilliant operation. In the pursuit of knowledge the comfort of the individual patient may be overlooked. Repeated examinations, note-takings, and demonstrations occur, and the attention of the lay authorities is or ought to be constantly directed to secure some regard for the patient's feelings and convenience. Thus, for example, while it is found needful to insist upon the regular medical visitation of all patients, it is not less requisite to demand that they shall not be unnecessarily disturbed at meal-times, during the visits of their friends, or late at night. Steps have also to be taken to ensure that the religious ministrations desired by the patient shall not be interrupted or postponed merely to allow of demonstrations for the benefit of medical callers; that grave, but not urgent, operations shall not be performed without the knowledge and sanction of the friends; and that the bodies of patients who have died shall be treated with decency, and shall not be made the subject of examination or of mutilation until the permission of the relations has been given. If these matters are rightly and humanely arranged, if scandal is avoided and confidence maintained, the patients and the patients' friends may thank the enactments and unceasing vigilance of the lay authorities.

When we come to consider the relations of house-physicians and house-surgeons to the governing body, the extent to which the benevolent side of the work gives place to the educational is made increasingly manifest. No complaint against these gentlemen is intended, nor even against the conditions under which their services are given to the hospital. These, to some extent at least, are unavoidable. The contention is for the supremacy of lay control, not that the medical and educational element shall be eliminated. The holders of resident offices accept them and value them only as affording opportunities for advancing their professional education. The offices are often awarded by way of prizes to the most successful students of the hospital school, and are held for a brief stipulated time, commonly for no more than six months. To say that these gentlemen as a class are convinced of their own infallibility in all their dealings with laymen is only to say that they are medical and have the stimulus of youth. The serious point is that although resident in the hospital, remunerated from its funds, and ostensibly subordinate to its government, their professional status and pretensions secure for them considerable immunity from control, and they regard the medical staff as the only authority calling for recognition on their part.

Obviously the hospital cannot be best served by inexperienced youths who are never really identified with the institution, who hold office for short periods, and then give place to others of like age and standing. Nominally, these appointments are made by the governing

board, but the board act upon the recommendation of the medical staff, and only in the rarest instances are the lay government asked for a testimonial or consulted as to its purport. It is given by the individual members of the staff with whom the resident has been more particularly associated in matters of professional work, but who may know nothing of his personal conduct. Thus one chief safeguard is wanting, and a resident who from the hospital point of view has been unsatisfactory may become possessed of unimpeachable testimonials. Outside their professional duties these officers are more or less a law to themselves. If they should happen to be negligent of their professional work, or if they make professional errors, the member of the staff concerned may be relied upon to mark his displeasure, but in all likelihood he will not take the lay authorities into his confidence. If, in addition to discharging their medical duties capably, the residents recognise other obligations; if they are kind and considerate to the patients, courteous to fellow-officials, economical in the use of hospital property, scrupulous in their relations to the nurses and regular in their general habits, it is chiefly no doubt when their nature or their pleasure is to be thus correct, but it is also when the lay government, notwithstanding the difficulties in their way, concern themselves about these things and maintain amid the changeful and distinctly unfavourable conditions which obtain, a never-failing watchfulness and control.

To safeguard the continuous authority of the lay management the presence from day to day of a capable and trusted representative is indispensable. This officer, whatever his title, must be supreme, responsible only to his board, and while in no sense opposed to the medical staff—but, on the contrary, fully conscious of their importance and earnestly solicitous to promote their legitimate wishes—he must be entirely independent of their authority. This independence is unattainable when members of the medical staff are included in the governing board. Moreover, the existence of a medical group within that body supplies opportunities for *sub rosa* communications from the resident staff, and still further increases the already excessive powers of the house-physicians and house-surgeons. Even when it is proposed to limit the representation to small numbers, we must not overlook the fact that the important principle to be maintained is that the members of the medical staff, being officers and servants of the hospital, should not be included in its governing body. This principle is violated equally whether the representation be by two or twenty; while we have further to remember that the actual power of a board or committee is easily usurped by its most militant and aggressive members, however small their number. The position of medical members must necessarily be that of delegates seeking to enforce their arguments by the weight of conclusions already arrived at by their colleagues behind them.

Medical ethics admit of no compromise, because they admit of no toleration.

It has been argued that the custom of provincial hospitals is to have the staff represented upon the board, and that the result is advantageous. This argument is reasonable as far as it goes, but it does not go far. The conditions obtaining in a country hospital and those in an important London hospital have no more in common than the general practitioner has with a Harley Street consultant. The family doctor is not only the professional adviser, he is the trusted friend. 'I never make friends of my patients,' said a distinguished physician, and he is not alone in his practice. Whether in regard to his private patients or his hospital duties, the Metropolitan consultant exalts himself high above his professional brethren of the provinces and the suburbs. His decision is one from which there is no appeal. 'If we had gone to the Bar,' remarked a physician, speaking of himself and his colleagues, 'we should not have been K.C.s, we should have been judges.' If they had entered the Church, it may be assumed that they would have expected to become something more than bishops. And precisely in the degree that this ample view of his position is taken by a member of the staff, and accepted by other people, is his unsuitability for a seat at the governing board of a hospital accentuated. The local provincial practitioner is the friend, neighbour, and equal of his colleagues of the committee, and he aspires to be no more. Even if he did, the presence of the squire, the clergyman, and the banker would supply a sufficient counterpoise to his pretensions. How different is the common attitude of the members of the staff of a London hospital is well illustrated by the words of a surgeon who not long ago stated seriously in the *Times* that he was not acquainted with the names or persons of the members of the board of the hospital with which he had been connected for more than fifteen years!

All together, and each in his place, the members of a provincial committee, whether medical or lay, are actuated by harmonious views to an extent unapproached in a Metropolitan hospital, where the staff are disposed to look upon the presence and necessities of philanthropy much as a rich man of the world looks upon the claims of a poor relation. The local practitioner, equally with his lay co-workers, regards the hospital as an organisation to help the sick poor back to health; and the pursuit of purely scientific ends, when attempted at all, is regarded as quite secondary in importance. Neither do the doctors and surgeons of the ordinary country hospital obtain adequate return from their connection with the institution. Their brother-practitioners seldom see them in consultation; when they do, the fee which passes is small. Their time and skill actually are free gifts to the poor; in London these offerings are bartered.

A common error is to suppose that patients, when they enter a

hospital, obtain the benefit of the collective wisdom and experience of the staff. This, of course, is impracticable. A patient is admitted to the care of one member, who with his house-physician or house-surgeon are the only persons medically concerned, unless we include the clerks and other underlings. If the patient has, or supposes he has, a cause of complaint against his medical attendant, it would be useless for him to make it known to the resident house-physician or to a clinical assistant. In the reverse case, it would be almost equally useless for the patient to complain to the visiting member of the staff concerning the house-physician. Complaints by patients are certain of consideration only when communicated to the lay authorities, with whom it is of the utmost importance that the patients should be in constant touch, and whose authority and independence of medical constraints should be well understood and constantly made manifest.

Little, therefore, is more necessary for the patient's welfare than that the nurses should be regarded as strictly under lay and not under medical control. This is not to suggest a fallacy. We must discriminate between nurses and nursing. The nursing of a patient is essentially of the treatment, and the prescription of the medical officer is unquestionable. But none the less it is an un-mixed evil when nurses look for their rules of general conduct to the house-doctors rather than to the matron, or when the matron conceives her duty to be towards the medical in preference to the lay authorities. Sisters and nurses who endeavour to exalt their own position by becoming merely satellites of the doctor, only sacrifice a large part of their usefulness and not a little of their womanhood and humanity.

The helpless position of a hospital patient left without opportunity of appeal is manifest. Even if his complaint lacks reasonableness, it is only right it should be dealt with, and his mind set at rest. Few things can be more barbarous than to refuse a sick man the comfort of making known his grievance, or to punish him for having broken silence. Yet it is certain that in nearly all cases a patient who ventured upon a complaint, or even an inquiry, involving the doctors, would be at once discharged; or if, owing to his bodily condition that was impossible, he would remain a marked man to the end of the chapter.

It is all-important, therefore that the matron, who more than any other worker is privileged to embody in her own person and actions the philanthropic principle to which all else in hospital life should be subsidiary, must regard herself as the friend and comforter of the patients. When it is possible, she ought to know and to be known to every inmate, and by the force of her example among the sisters and nurses she should encourage the all-powerful sentiment of sympathy, without which the most skilful nursing lacks something

essential. Yet it too often happens that the matron, however discreet in her attitude, has to reckon with the subtle but not less effective opposition which, emanating from the resident medical staff, in time involves the nurses; and although there are residents *and* residents, it may be said of most of them that they are apt to regard the matron in the wards as a wholly unnecessary intruder.

With the establishment some years ago of the Royal British Nurses' Association an organised effort was made to erect nursing into a 'profession.' Laymen were ostentatiously excluded from taking any part in the management, which was given entirely into the hands of doctors and nurses. The result from a business point of view was disastrous. Dissensions soon showed themselves; bankruptcy threatened, and probably nothing except the favour and support of its Royal President saved the association from collapse. The attempt to separate nurses from the laity bore fruit, however, and, as some few people ventured to predict at the outset, the hospitals have suffered. The nurse who is too completely surrendered to the professional idea—happily the tendency is not general—no longer identifies herself with the hospital where she is employed, she no longer regards her hospital as her home, nor is she content to perform the good work which comes in her way. Her attitude is that of the medical student, whom she is apt to imitate even in his contempt for an economical use of hospital goods. The nurse of to-day is commonly more cultured than her predecessors of a past generation. She has more book-knowledge, and she is more capable generally; but on the other hand, while the very genesis of nursing aptitude may be described as the power of self-sacrifice, her mind is much too often filled with the merely selfish aspect of the duties she is performing. She is concerned chiefly with her own advancement; she looks upon the time spent in this or that hospital as employed educationally; and she regards the patients, not illogically, less as sufferers to be ministered to, than as 'cases' from which something is to be learned. As a consequence, the hospital nursing staff, like the staff of house-doctors, is always undergoing change; the nurses are novices in far too great a proportion, and the patients lose something of the human interest and tenderness which count for much with sick folk.

It would be foolish to deny that hospitals must have a teaching side, whether in respect of medicine or nursing. But it is not inconsistent with the admission to point out that one chief difficulty about their administration springs directly from this combination of conflicting objects. Given the fact that the requirements of the hospital are not always those of the school, and further, as is not yet questioned, that the needs of the hospital are paramount, we have in a word the reason why the lay control of hospitals should not only be maintained but strengthened. When custom has determined that the

purposes of the school shall be allotted the first place, then and then only will the time have arrived for the supreme authority to be surrendered to the profession.

In one of the addresses delivered to the several medical schools at the opening of the current session the speaker dealt with the important question of the justifiability of applying the funds of the hospital to the purposes of teaching and research. The inclination of the average layman would be to regard such application as unjustifiable, but the suggestion that there are wealthy philanthropists who would be willing to aid the medical schools by contributing directly to them is reasonable, and if acted upon to any large extent might help to remove one of the difficulties confronting our hospitals, though as much as ever it would be necessary to maintain unimpaired the safeguard of lay supremacy. The simple fact that the profession is willing to accept and use for educational purposes charitable gifts, whether made to the hospital or to the school—which could have no existence without the hospital—is sufficient evidence of the obligation under which its members rest.

To complete the picture, we ought to see each school of medicine possessed of a 'hospital' of its own—that is, a place where the relations we stipulate for in hospitals shall be reversed, and where patients shall be admitted primarily for purposes of research and experiment, and only secondarily, if at all, for their own benefit. Then, we should have a fair opportunity of witnessing how far the indispensable donor would be forthcoming, and, what is still more doubtful, whether the equally indispensable patient would be willing to submit himself to the good offices of the physician, the surgeon, the resident, and the student, uncontrolled by lay government.

B. BURFORD RAWLINGS.

THE BACTERIA BEDS OF MODERN SANITATION

It is not much more than thirty years ago since the subject of domestic sanitation began to impress the public mind. In previous decades the subject was never raised because no one thought of it. It took little, if any, place in the medical or general literature of the day. It was no one's duty to think of it; the architect who planned the houses and laid out new streets never thought of it; the artless plumber never thought of it, nor dreamt of associating his craft with disease. The sense of responsibility could not exist where no one was held responsible. While all were content to live in the paradise of fools the Government rested in peace, for no answers were required to questions that were never asked. Consequently there were no laws or regulations worthy of the name, no Board of Public Health. And yet for centuries this subject was crying aloud for notice, but in the universal chaos no one understood the cry. When sickness came, and death followed, it was simply accepted in deepest reverence and awe as the will of the Almighty, and so the troubled waters of affliction rose and fell, and history went on repeating itself.

Looking back from the present changed condition of human thought, it is difficult to understand how the grandparents of to-day lived at all, except on the Darwinian theory of survival of the fittest. Personally, I can recollect using the cistern on the nursery floor of my father's house as an ocean for the sailing of boats laden with merchandise of every kind. When the sea rose—which it could always do at pleasure—the merchandise would be lost, and I can see it now in mystic shapes lying at the bottom. No one thought it worth while to interfere with this amusement; but as overflow pipes in those days were not directed into the open air, and as nothing was right, and everything was wrong, a few shipwrecks more or less could make little difference, and in all probability were the lesser or many worse evils.

In the midst of this we suffered the usual penalties of ignorance, only no one ever recognised the connection between the penalties

and the ignorance, and we took our fevers and desperate periods of illness as they came. The survivors were simply sent to the country to recover; but my recollections of rural life from a sanitarian's point of view would hardly bear description. Still, strange to say, we would all come back in bounding health to get our systems 'educated' (as science has it) or accustomed once more to the unhealthy conditions we had left behind. In the one case the mischief lay entirely out-of-doors; in the other, the concentrated essence of drain poisoning reached us from within, through cisterns and pipes in every quarter.

Throughout the town there was no system of house drainage, only pipes, or rather tubes, under the streets—composed in all probability of the hollow trunks of trees, and meant solely to carry off rain-water. Hence each house was a law unto itself, consequently the beautiful town of New Edinburgh was little removed from the historical horrors of the Old Town so far as health was concerned. In those early days the cry of 'Gardez l'eau!' could still be heard in the narrow wynds off the High Street, and I can remember hearing that cry, and being instantly dragged by my friend within a doorway when 'Gardez l'eau!' rang through the air, followed by a splash from a window in one of the narrow old streets of Elgin. This notification had come down from the days of Mary Queen of Scots, and was supposed to be all-sufficient.

The reason that we managed to survive was due no doubt to the fact that the human organism can be educated to bear a certain amount of poison. Dr. Joseph Priestley, the great discoverer of oxygen, proved that birds or mice put suddenly into an unhealthy atmosphere would die at once, whereas others, if gradually accustomed to it, would live. It is on the same principle that people suffering from the bite of a mad dog are subjected to successive inoculations of a similar poison in order to 'educate' the system to bear finally a virus so intense that it neutralises the power of the original poison. Still, it is not pleasant to think of our forefathers receiving this education minus the guiding hand of science, and having to run the gauntlet of so much preventible disease with all the accompaniments of suffering. The sorrow of it is beautifully expressed by Watts in his touching picture of young Love vainly struggling to keep back the grim spectre of Death, whose hand is already on the rose-covered door.

In the midst of such sanitary chaos the Prince Consort died, and all that Love could do was powerless to keep back Death from the palace door. This deeply lamented tragedy struck a note of alarm throughout the land, and caused the wrappings of ignorance slowly to fall away and reveal to us the truth. The physicians of the day were now fully alive to cause and effect, and began to urge the necessity of reform. For some time Sir Robert Rawlinson and other

pioneers had been successful in persuading the Government to establish a Board of Public Health, and through this channel Acts of Parliament had been issued, and big things were done. They were done, however, before the ground was ready, before the householder understood the nature of the edict, before the British workman understood the *raison d'être* of his work, and the results were deplorable. Without attempting to be chronological, and without dwelling further on public failures which are matters of history, we shall pass on to the private efforts that brought the National Health Society into existence. It was initiated by Mr. Ernest Hart, and consisted of Sir Robert Rawlinson, Sir Edwin Chadwick, a dozen or so of practical men, and a sprinkling of women, with Miss Lankester as secretary. The meetings took place in the small first-floor front of a miserably insanitary house not far from the spacious and healthy quarters the society now enjoys. At these meetings it was fully recognised that the fashionable world was now alive to the dangers behind the walls and under the floors of their dwellings; but a certain apathy prevailed, for the denizens of that world knew not what to do. In order to dispel this apathy the society resolved to offer help to the helpless in a series of drawing-room lectures, and owing to the energy of two or three of the ladies, and the willing services of the more practical members, these lectures proved of the greatest use.

The drawing-rooms of Mayfair now opened their elegant doors to the reception of objects such as no self-respecting drawing-room had ever seen or dreamt of before. Footmen were kept busy under the secretarial eye running to and fro with rat-riddled lead pipes and a variety of curiosities brought together to illustrate the lectures. In the midst of priceless works of art hung diagrams of an appalling nature, but no one saw the incongruity, so intense was the interest in things never seen before. The rooms were crowded, and generally graced by the presence of royalty. From these drawing-rooms news spread, and the long-tabooed subject became so popular that at length no one was ashamed to inquire into the state of the drains.

While the upper classes were thus reached, the Sanitary Institute (more recently established) was doing equally good work of a more technical kind among the engineers, architects, and plumbers. Many members of the one society became members of the other, and the two have invariably worked together for the public good. The result of this co-operation is that no one dreams of taking a house now without a sanitary inspector's certificate, and no surgeon will undertake a serious operation in a house of doubtful sanitary reputation.

In looking back to this time it is interesting to observe that the awakening came simultaneously with the discovery of the living

cause of most diseases. The knowledge of the nature of disease *au fond* had been withheld from us for all the countless centuries of the world's history till Pasteur in his researches in molecular physics demonstrated the vitality of ferments, *i.e.* that all decomposition and fermentation was caused by living organisms, visible only under the microscope. From this little siding of knowledge we soon reached the main line, whence we could trace disease to its living cause, and eventually came on many junctions leading to fresh discoveries of inestimable value to mankind. We are now so accustomed to the word 'bacteria,' which is used in a general sense to describe these living organisms, that further explanation is unnecessary.

The result of these discoveries, as we are all aware, has been to reform first surgical, and later medical practice, and to establish laboratories for the investigation of disease in connection with hospitals in every enlightened country. But what few are aware of is the fact that the principles which have led to the antiseptic treatment of wounds are found to be equally applicable to the treatment of sewage, only reversed. Where the surgeon aims at destroying bacteria to prevent the bacteria destroying his patient, the sanitary engineer invokes the aid of the bacteria to assist him in destroying and getting rid of refuse. Hence the sewage of London is now disposed of in the end through the agency of these invisible beings, acting in the river water, and when the London County Council extend the present bacteria beds sufficiently to treat the whole of the sewage by their means, the condition of the river will be even better than it is now. In the meantime it is entirely due to the chemical researches of Mr. Dibdin in this country, and later in co-operation with others in America, that millions have been saved to the ratepayers by the recognition of the action of bacteria, and by the adoption of his bacteria beds.¹

They are sometimes called filter beds, because the effluent comes out sweet and clear; but it is not through filtration the mighty change is effected, but by the co-operation of the two great classes of bacteria, the aerobies and the anaerobies of Pasteur—*i.e.* those that live in the presence of oxygen, and those whose work is carried on in the absence of oxygen. Before this new method was worked out and matured by laboratory experiments we were doing all we could, and at an enormous cost, to kill the living organisms present in all sewage by the use of chemicals. Now everything is done to promote their welfare, for at last we have recognised in these lowliest creatures the most powerful chemists the world can command. They are ever present, and always ready to do the work inoffensively with the aid of man.

In a field about a hundred yards from my country house bacteria

¹ By the adoption of this scheme, even experimentally, London was saved an expense of ten millions sterling.

beds have been established in the simplest way possible under my own supervision, but it is only fair to add that the model I humbly copied was established in the neighbouring grounds by Dibdin himself. My first introduction to these neighbouring bacteria beds came as a surprise. I had heard nothing of the project, but on returning to the country after spending the winter and spring in town I strolled into the woods one summer evening where I had often strolled before, and suddenly found my immediate surroundings entirely changed. The wild tangle of my expectation had been cleared, my footsteps, unaccustomed in these parts to civilisation, began to tread unwonted gravel paths—in short, the dell of yore was transformed into beautifully laid out pleasure-grounds!

Beyond on the higher ground stood formidable-looking breastworks which at first I could not understand, but soon discovered to be the bacteria beds of modern sanitation. As a member of the two societies I have mentioned, I quickly realised that I had wandered unexpectedly into a vast sylvan laboratory designed by man to assist Nature in her newly appointed work. There was no monotonous thud of noisy machinery to break the silence, nothing but birds singing madrigals around, and the trickling of the stream as it came down from the beds in a series of miniature cascades. Thence it went winding about in and out of rockeries and gravelled ways, amongst reeds, sedges, and water-plants of every kind. Finally the stream ended in an artificial lake, on which water-lilies grew and afforded shade to the goldfish casting giants of light from below. Gazing into the clear pool it was difficult to realise that this was the effluent of all the drainage coming from the mansion and home farm beyond.

But to pursue our investigation we must proceed up the dell, along by the rustic walls confining the stream, to the bacteria beds where this wonderful chemical change is effected. These, from below or at a distance, look like breastworks, as I have said, but from above they are simply two large and somewhat shallow tanks lying side by side, with another in front, all being built of brick and cement. The first two are filled with lumps of coke, and the other in front with fine coke. On the forefront of the lateral beds there is another chamber, but this is closed and different from the others. This, in fact, is the first reception-chamber, through which all the drainage has to pass. It is the home of the anaerobes, quite small and dark, but has two channels leading to the coke beds, one or other channel being opened on alternate days to allow the fluid to pass onward. Meanwhile the solid matter is retained in the reception-chamber, and rapidly disintegrated and liquefied by the ceaseless action of the anaerobes, those organisms which live without air. It then passes along with the fluids to be further dealt with by the aerobes in the coke beds, whose 'finishing' work is done through oxidation. The object of the two coke beds side by side is to give each bed

breathing-time—that is to say, each alternately has twenty-four hours off duty in order to take in fresh supplies of oxygen from the air and rain. This enables the organisms to multiply with great rapidity and to become more and more effectual as time goes on. The third coke bed, of finer material, and which is daily in use, is intended for further purification before letting forth the stream. Other materials, less expensive than coke, such as clinkers, burnt brick, or old tins, would serve the purpose equally well, the object being to present as many rough surfaces to the air as possible, and to prevent clogging.

In the end, as we have seen, the effluent may serve to adorn pleasure-grounds, or may flow into a trout stream without harm to fish or fisher. But supposing for a moment we placed airtight lids over these free and airy coke beds while full? Then, indeed, all would be changed, for it would mean death to the aerobies and life to the anaerobies, who would quickly convert everything into a seething mass of decomposition, tainting the air and destroying the fish in the pool. This is a law of nature from which there is no running away, for to these microscopic organisms is given the great work of re-establishing the equilibrium of life by giving back to it all that it has formed.* It manifests itself everywhere, even to the end of life when the lungs have ceased to breathe—have ceased, that is, *to take in oxygen*, thus leaving our bodies a prey to the anaerobies, who complete their work in the grave.

It is interesting to know that the bacteria beds of modern sanitation can be equally efficacious whether expensively carried out or simply. The principle is the same, and if understood could be adopted in all parts of the world, in rocky places such as Gibraltar, in the bush, or with armies in the field, so long as the ground afforded a natural fall for the drainage. The plan has recently been started at Harrow School with great success, but could only be adopted by Eton, for instance, by pumping, owing to the low-lying level. It is also in use for the destruction of refuse from distilleries, the effluent of which may now pass into neighbouring streams without injuring the salmon and reducing the value of the fisheries. The only refuse which so far defies Nature's process is that which comes from certain paper-mills; but perhaps in time this also may be overcome, to add one more rosebud to the ever-increasing chaplet of science.

ELIZA PRIESTLEY.

* Pasteur.

BRITISH COMMUNICATION WITH EAST AND SOUTH AFRICA

Is there any other part of the world besides East Africa where so large an extent of British territory or protectorate is supplied chiefly by foreign vessels? Annual consular reports, so laboriously drawn up and so little read, testify that the trade of that vast coast-line—which begins at the Equator and extends to Cape Colony—more and more relies upon foreign shipping. The British public is probably but dimly conscious of the development, expects to ‘muddle along’ somehow, and anticipates that with patience and inaction all will come right. The trade of Mombasa and Uganda, of Zanzibar and Pemba is in the balance, also of British Central Africa, as well as of Rhodesia and the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, for they are largely supplied from Beira and Delagoa Bay, not to mention the trade of Natal and the Cape Colony itself. As I believe I am the only member of Parliament who has lately travelled past the whole of the east coast of Africa, and landed at a number of the ports, I write partly from an uneasy sense of personal experience. And the whole question calls the more urgently for public attention at this moment because from the 1st of April, 1901, the subsidy paid annually by the German Government to the German East Africa Steamship Company is to be increased from 45,000*l.* a year to 67,500*l.* a year, in order if possible to strengthen the hands of the company, and under condition that their ships touch not merely along the East African coast, but make a circular tour of the entire continent. It will be necessary to refer to this increased subsidy more fully later on, and to the policy upon which it is based, as explained to the German Reichstag.

It has been very inadequately realised, by the critics of the cession of Heligoland to Germany in 1890 in exchange for our unfettered protectorate over Zanzibar, what enormous trading advantages and prestige this country acquired by the arrangement. Zanzibar is the great emporium of East Africa, just as Bombay is of India, or even London of the United Kingdom. To possess and control its chief trade commands great respect and weight in the eyes of the natives, and of the numerous Indian merchants who have come

over from India and established warehouses. It enhances through a very wide area the authority of British power. To lose it would inevitably lead to a proportionate loss and damage to British authority. If British trade and closer union between the various parts of our Empire have any beneficent value at all, our trade in Zanzibar must be maintained. And yet statistics show that the tonnage of German vessels entering the harbour far exceeds that of British vessels, and that German trade is steadily increasing at the expense of the British manufacturer.¹ In 1899, 98 German vessels entered the port of Zanzibar, with a total tonnage of 168,113, while only 69 British vessels entered it, with a total tonnage of 103,457. Altogether it was entered by 198 ocean-going vessels during the year, the remainder being twenty-six French, three Norwegian, and two from the United States. Nor is any attempt made to establish direct British steamship communication between the United Kingdom and East Africa, in friendly rivalry with the subsidized German and French Messageries lines. Passengers or cargo can go direct from Hamburg or Marseilles to Zanzibar, but from London it is necessary to tranship at Aden into the British India Company's steamers. With regard to cargo, it is sufficient to refer to the last Zanzibar consular report, which points out the risk which is entailed of the cargo being delayed or perhaps shut out at Aden, besides the additional risk of exposure to the weather in open lighters whilst awaiting transhipment. Presumably this delay at Aden is the reason why it was found necessary to charter direct steamers from Cardiff once a month for Uganda railway material, but these vessels are too slow to carry mails and unsuitable for the conveyance of passengers. Their existence is another proof of the need of direct communication. The inconvenience of transhipment to passengers is obvious enough, but, as though it were not, the rates of passage by the British India Company's line appear to be positively higher for the unwelcome privileges of changing at Aden and travelling at a slower rate of speed than are the fares on the foreign lines. I am informed that the first-class fare by British India steamer from London to Zanzibar, with the change at Aden, is 57*l.* 15*s.*; by German East Africa Company without the change it is 42*l.* 10*s.*; and by French Messageries from Marseilles to Zanzibar (consequently a rather shorter mileage) without a change 40*l.* 14*s.* Even this does not complete the advantages offered by the foreign lines. On the German line, if the traveller happens to be in the official employment of his country, no matter to what nationality he may belong, he obtains a reduction of 10 per cent. on the ordinary cost of his ticket, and this privilege is also extended to his wife and family. On the Messageries Maritimes line a rebate of 15 per cent. is allowed to consuls and other officials of any nation, as well as to their wives and families, but the scale of

¹ *Consular Report on Zanzibar for 1899*, Foreign Office, 1900.

fares is a little higher than on the German line. The British India Company, like any British steamship company, recognises no such preferences, and they could only be granted in any particular case by the express consent of the board of directors.

The hardship of transhipment at Aden by the British India steamers is sometimes materially aggravated because every now and then the plague appears at Aden, as was the case last year, and it then becomes necessary for passengers from Zanzibar to Europe to join the P. and O. steamer at Bombay, a *détour* which few care to take.

No doubt these special inducements by rebates on fares and the subsidies granted to the companies are not the sole causes why trade tends in ever larger proportions to fall into foreign hands, to the detriment of Great Britain. They are important causes, but the British manufacturer is partly to blame because, hitherto he has been too disinclined to study native fancies and wants. For instance, native Zanzibari women prefer bright and striking devices on the printed cotton handkerchiefs or 'kangas,' usually red and white, which they wear—devices suggestive of their country or surroundings, such as well-printed elephants or flags, rather than commonplace patterns suggestive of indiscriminating Manchester production. Zanzibar cherishes fashions no less than Paris. Traders will not succeed by saying in effect to the natives 'We consider we manufacture the best possible quality and design of goods which you can want; if you do not care about them, the loss is yours, and we cannot help you to others.' It is precisely the same frame of mind among British manufacturers of mining machinery which has caused so many of the Johannesburg companies to place their orders in the United States or Germany.

But it is by no means only the trade of Zanzibar, important as it is, which requires attention. The same tale is told of nearly every harbour along the whole coast which serves British territory. The consular report respecting the trade of our East Africa Protectorate for 1899 states that 'a direct line of British steamers between London and Mombasa would go far to stimulate trade in British goods, as importers are strongly averse to the delays and damages which transhipment entails. . . . The gross registered steam tonnage which entered the port in 1899 was 218,089 tons, represented by 142 steamers. Of this tonnage 90,126 tons was English, and 127,963 tons German.' Following the coast southwards past Zanzibar, Mozambique is the next chief harbour, but it belongs to Portugal, the *hinterland* is Portuguese, and there is no connection with British territory. Here alone the consular report states, after mentioning the German East Africa Line and the Messageries Maritimes, that 'there is little inducement for other companies to enter into competition as yet,' and this comment probably applies to Quillimane, a small port southwards, which belongs to Portugal and

is exclusively used to serve Portuguese territory. Chinde, another small port, at the mouth of the Zambesi, would be of greater use for supplying British Central Africa but for the serious obstacle of the river bar. Beira, on the other hand, has every prospect of increasing trade. 'The end of the year 1900,' runs the report on that harbour, written by our unfortunate consul, Mr. McMaster, who was murdered by a Boer sympathiser in his office there about a year ago, 'should show a very great increase of trade at this port; the opening of the railway to Salisbury, its extension to Gwelo and Bulawayo, the importation of machinery, the opening of and satisfactory returns from the mining districts of Manica and Rhodesia, with the necessary sequence of increase of population, will all materially tend to this result.' And if this is a true forecast of the trade with Beira, what will the trade be with the Transvaal colony through Delagoa Bay with the stimulus that will follow upon peace?

Even before the war the Germans attached so much importance to the increase of trade with the Transvaal that they gave every possible facility so as to make the shipment of goods to East African ports as easy as consignments made within the German Empire; and through bills of lading were granted by the German railways to most of the German East African ports, and to Pretoria and Johannesburg, in connection with the German East Africa Company and the Netherlands South African Railway Company. These bills guaranteed the goods being delivered in good condition, and included marine insurance. In fact a system has been established, by agreement between the German Government and the East Africa Company, by which all goods exported from inland places in Germany by steamers of the company with through bills of lading to East Africa (and until recently to the Transvaal via Delagoa Bay), enjoy largely reduced rates of freight on the German State Railway. The effect of this is that the entire export trade from the interior of Germany to the ports and countries visited by the East Africa Company's steamers is in the hands of the East Africa Company. The company's steamers are now also to run regularly to Cape Town and ports in Cape Colony and some ports in West Africa from the 1st of April, and presumably there will be similar largely reduced rates of freight to those ports for goods which are exported from the interior of Germany with through bills of lading, just as there have been to the East African ports. And the experience of Germany is that this method of introducing German goods creates an increasing demand for them in these countries into which they are thus pushed. To put it shortly, it extends German trade. The increase in value of purely German goods traffic on the East African Line between 1891 and 1898 has risen from 300,900*l.* to 955,600*l.*² The value of

² *Consular Report, Extension of German Subsidised Mail Steamers to South Africa, Foreign Office, 1900.*

British exports to Zanzibar and Pemba in 1892, the first year for which figures are given, was 105,670*l.*; in 1898 it was 114,217*l.*; in 1899 113,914*l.*; and in 1900, approximately, 76,509*l.* (Board of Trade returns).

What an opportunity is now afforded of establishing, for the benefit of our great centre at Zanzibar and future trade by Delagoa Bay to the Transvaal Colony, through bills of lading by a British steamship company circumnavigating Africa, if Great Britain and the House of Commons are disposed to give such a company any encouragement! Perhaps also British railway companies would be induced to co-operate in the scheme by reducing their rates in such cases in view of the exceptional circumstances, and desirability of assisting the British development of the Transvaal. The Netherlands South African Railway Company would no longer be an obstacle. Formerly, as the tool of Mr. Kruger's Government, which received 85 per cent. of its profits, its corrupt administration and hostility to Great Britain became notorious. All that is now history. Its bygone management has passed into British hands. Delagoa Bay is only 56 miles from the Transvaal Colony frontier, while Cape Town is 964 miles from it, and Port Elizabeth 663, and the distance from London to Delagoa Bay via Zanzibar is only about 600 miles further than from London to Delagoa Bay via Cape Town, a matter of no consequence if the steamers are to circumnavigate Africa, and of subordinate importance even if they do not. There can be no question about the growing trade of East and South-East Africa, and the Germans are shrewd enough to be prompt in acquiring a secure footing.

What are the special reasons for this policy of Germany?—a policy the more striking because it cannot be doubted that the German East Africa Steamship Company would not at present pay its way but for the Government subsidy which it receives. According to its latest annual report the shareholders in 1899 received a dividend of 6 per cent. which rose to 8 per cent. in 1900. But this 8 per cent. dividend consisted of the distribution among the shareholders of a sum of 600,000 marks, and, as the Government subsidy is 900,000 marks, it is perfectly plain that without the Government subsidy the accounts of the company would have been some 300,000 marks (15,000*l.*) to the bad. And since the receipts for last year included a sum of 400,000 marks received as damages from the British Government for the arrest of the *Bundesrath* and other East Africa Line steamers, this windfall doubtless contributed largely towards augmenting the annual profits. The reasons for granting the subsidy must have been cogent to outweigh these financial disadvantages.

Instructive information on this point may be gathered from a study of a memorandum presented to the Reichstag with the Bill of

1900 granting the additional subsidy. Some of the reasons there given are as follows:—the freeing of German commerce from the agency of foreign nations both as regards foreign business houses and in shipping matters; the avoidance of the damage resulting from transshipment; the possibility of transmitting mails independently of foreign countries; the economic importance of Cape Colony for the development of German commerce; the opening up of harbours for communication with the important territory of the Transvaal in addition to Delagoa Bay. In general it was considered that considerable expansion would be open to German export trade and import trade. It was further argued that the indirect advantages derived from the subsidy system were as great as the direct advantages; for from the introduction of the system dates the success of German shipbuilding, all large ships having until then been built in the United Kingdom. Ships are now not only built, but repaired in Germany, and furnished with coals and provisions in German ports; so that altogether millions of marks are expended in Germany which used formerly to go to the United Kingdom by one channel or another. So strongly is German policy gravitating in the direction of obtaining a firm grasp or monopoly by means of merchant shipping throughout the world that recently an English line of steamers from Bangkok to Singapore was bought up by Germans for three times its value—a good illustration, indeed, of the kind of policy which is being pursued. The most important object—as the British Commercial Attaché at Berlin comments in a diplomatic memorandum—which the German Government hope to obtain by extending their subsidised steamer communications right round Africa, is to assist and embolden the determined effort that is to be made to secure a far larger proportion than hitherto of the internal South African trade for German industrial products.

Yet, though all these facts may be true, there are many people who oppose a subsidy on principle. They say that it is perilously near a disregard of the principle of free trade, in which I for one believe, and that it sails dangerously near the wind of protection. They say that it is bad political economy, and as such that it cannot be admitted. They conjure up a phantom of free trade which distorts their view of its true basis. The whole contention of the original freetraders was that consumers throughout the world should be able to buy the best goods in the cheapest market at their natural price. Free trade resists the bolstering up of a price at a fictitious value, but does not oppose adopting means for restoring natural prices where these prices have been disturbed by extraneous circumstances. If through famine or drought or other disturbing cause the natural price becomes abnormal, it must either be argued that the affected producers must starve on the ground of strict political economy, or else that they must be given assistance to

restore the natural price. The latter is the most practical argument, even though it be challenged as not being the most theoretical—I would almost say the most pedantic. Is the case of a hostile subsidy in the place of a famine very different? It disturbs the natural price. It gives an advantage—in this instance to the Germans in the East African market; and our own traders compete on an inequality, when equality of competition and exchange between the different countries, in articles which they are respectively best able to produce, is the very keystone of free trade. A British subsidy would restore the balance and revive the natural price.

Nor is Great Britain without a precedent if it granted a subsidy to a steamship company. Such a subsidy was recommended by the West India Royal Commission which reported in 1897. The new Imperial Direct West India Mail Service is subsidised to the amount of 40,000*l.* a year for five years, half of which is paid by the Imperial Government and half by Jamaica. It was established in deference to Colonial wishes, and coincided with the wise policy unswervingly pursued by Mr. Chamberlain to give as foremost a place as possible to colonial desires and colonial interests. It tends to cement together our great Empire. If the service fails the subsidy will not be renewed. Is the pleading of the numerous East African consular reports not deserving of more thoughtful consideration than it has received? Does it not supply evidence of Colonial opinion throughout the British possessions in East Africa? And a subsidy little in excess of that paid to the West Indian line would be a great incentive to a British company to secure a good share of the trade for the British flag. We have assented to countervailing duties in India; what hinders us on principle from assenting to countervailing subsidies in East Africa?

It will not do to flatter ourselves that we can wait until the German East Africa Company or any other foreign company has reached a point prosperous enough for us to step in and oust it. No doubt the ideal would be to delay until a colony or country affords sufficient trade for a steamship line visiting it to pay a good dividend, and then supply it with the sea communication requisite for import and export. But in this case at any rate that course is quite impossible. The German contention is that the cost to the German taxpayer of pushing trade by subsidies is amply repaid in the long run by the vastly increased volume and prosperity of the trade. The policy may be right or wrong, but the trade returns quoted two or three pages back seem to justify it. Through bills of lading probably contribute towards the result. The German flag is respected throughout the East African coast—I saw it myself, I certainly bear it no grudge, and say this very sincerely to its praise and credit. Yet from a purely British and British Colonial point of view, unless we subsidise one or more British lines, which must be efficient and up-

to-date both for passengers and goods, the German line and possibly the Messageries Maritimes, & steamers of any other enterprising nationality, will very surely in the course of a few years drive British exports to those parts of Africa out of the market. Merchants are, like human nature is in general, very conservative at bottom, and do not readily change to another steamship line when they have become accustomed to a good article and been well served. After the establishment of the German line eastwards and westwards round Africa not only will it absorb a very large proportion of British cargo, but also of British passenger traffic, owing to its superior accommodation and comfort. It is difficult to see how British steamship companies are to hold their own, or rather how they are to assist in maintaining and promoting British export trade from the United Kingdom to East, South, and West Africa, and how they are to compete in all other respects with a line which enjoys a subsidy of 67,500*l.* a year and the monopoly of the German export trade, unless they receive at least equal support from His Majesty's Government. At any rate the system of subsidy might be tried as an experiment for five years. 'Penny wise, pound foolish,' is a very old proverb, and if we are penny wise at the present time in saving the annual cost of a subsidy, we may very possibly turn out some day to have been pound foolish when we find out that much of the trade to our own possessions, which we might have had, has been drifting slowly yet surely away and been permanently lost.

EVELYN CECIL.

COMPANY LAW REFORM FROM A BUSINESS MAN'S POINT OF VIEW

THE last attempt to reform the law of Joint Stock Companies (the Companies Act 1900) has been widely commented on and criticised by lawyers and journalists, but much of this criticism shows a want of practical acquaintance with the actual formation and working of companies, and consequently appears to the man of business wide of the mark. Having had some twenty-five years experience in connection with companies, in the various capacities of Secretary, Manager, Engineer, and Director, I venture to offer some observations upon this matter from the practical point of view, and, in order to keep a wide subject within moderate limits, I shall confine myself chiefly to mining companies, in which the losses and abuses to be remedied have been perhaps the most prominent.

The relation of lawyers to companies resembles that of doctors to mankind. They attend chiefly to the birth, diseases, and death of their patients, and see little of the normal working of healthy life. Hence the attitude of the lawyers towards companies is apt to be determined by their observation of diseased individuals, rather than by their limited contact with the healthy crowd. Hence also the advice of lawyers, necessarily biassed by their point of view, requires to be corrected by the business man's experience.

Not only the new Act, but much previous legislation on the same subject, has been injuriously affected by certain misconceptions, as I venture to think them, of the nature of a Board of Directors.

The lawyers have attempted to make the first directors of a company virtually promoters, and so to place them on the side of the seller, and yet at the same time they have treated them as trustees for the shareholders, the buyers.

I submit that the whole line of legislation by which, to put it shortly, directors are personally to guarantee the soundness of a prospectus, is futile in itself, as defeating its own object, and founded upon a wrong view of the position of directors.

For what is really the essence of the transaction in the formation and flotation of a joint stock company? In nine cases out of ten

it is simply a sale of a business, a concession or a mine, to a group of purchasers, who, being too numerous to manage the undertaking as a private firm would do, delegate the management to a committee of themselves, the board of directors. Theoretically, this committee might be chosen from the body of shareholders after they had subscribed the capital, as indeed all directors, after the first board, usually are. Practically, subscribers will not take shares unless they know beforehand who are to manage the concern at the outset, and moreover a heterogeneous body of strangers would certainly make a mess of selecting a board from among themselves; for few shareholders seem to understand what the qualifications of a good director are.

It is therefore unavoidable that in the first instance the vendors and promoters should select persons suitable and willing to act as a committee of management for the purchasers, the general body of shareholders. But why should this committee be expected to guarantee, at their own risk, the statements of the vendors? It is true that the ordinary maxim in cases of purchase and sale, *Caveat emptor*, is hardly applicable to the purchase, say, of a mine, by a joint stock company. Something in the nature of a warranty is desirable, no doubt; but I submit that the directors are not the proper persons to give it; the onus should be placed on the vendors. The notion that directors should warrant the statements of a prospectus appears to have arisen from the above-mentioned legal fiction that directors, as such, are promoters of the company—a doctrine which is not only opposed to the real facts, but also obscures the parties who should bear the responsibility.* It is not, or ought not to be, the directors who invite the subscriptions of the original capital of a company, but the vendors (actual or intermediate); that is, the real promoters. I am convinced that the greatest possible reform which could be made in company law would be to sweep away all the complications caused by the attempt to drag in directors and officers of a company as promoters, and to fix the responsibility upon the real promoters, who should be declared as such on the face of the prospectus, and required to warrant the statements contained in it as correct in themselves, and as including every material fact and contract which ought to be stated. The advantages of this plan would be numerous and far-reaching.

In the first place, it would fix the responsibility where it properly belongs, and assign the risk of the transaction to those who reap the profits of it.

It removes at a single blow the greatest difficulty which now lies in the way of obtaining capable, honest and substantial men as directors. Their names on a prospectus would mean that, assuming the promoters' statements to be true (for which the promoters alone would be responsible), they would be willing to manage the business for the shareholders. The position of the first directors would be, in

fact, the same as that of directors who subsequently join the board; and there seems no good reason why there should be any difference. No difficulty is found, as a rule, in prevailing on good men to accept seats on the board of a company after it has been floated, when the uncertain and unlimited risks of a first director have been eliminated.

Next, my proposal would defeat the dishonest promoter more effectually than any plans I have yet seen.

However you may pile up the risks and responsibilities of first directors, the fraudulent promoter will continue to find people ignorant enough, reckless enough, or dishonest enough to lend their names to him, and the foolish investor will be taken in by a string of these names. But when this investor is told that he must no longer look to a board of directors for his warranty, and that the promoter named in the prospectus is solely responsible, even he will want to know all about this gentleman, firm, or company, and if he does not, the respectable financial papers are sure to do it for him.

The result will be that the shady promoters' occupation will be gone. No company will have a chance of obtaining subscriptions unless backed by respectable, substantial sponsors as 'official promoters.'

The business of promoting will tend more and more to fall into the hands of established financial houses and companies, who have reputation and capital to lose, and who cannot afford to warrant doubtful or risky undertakings. Already there is a strong tendency in this direction, which would be much increased by the adoption of my plan of 'warranty by official promoters.' Nothing would do more to rescue joint-stock business from discredit and failure than this substitution of permanent, responsible agencies in the formation of companies for the hidden, fugitive and unsubstantial promoter of to-day.

The official promoters, who will either be the actual vendors or acting in conjunction with them, will have a far better knowledge of the facts, and therefore better means of judging what is material, than a board of directors can usually acquire. Moreover, it is more just, and better worth while, for the vendors who are selling their property to advantage to accept the unavoidable risk of litigation under this head than for directors, who gain nothing but a small fee, and who under the present system are asked to risk their whole fortunes. If the seller is found not to have sold what he represented he was selling, let him make good the damage by all means, but why expect the purchaser's managers to do so?

The proposed reform could be carried out by a short and simple clause in a new Company's Act to the following effect:

Every prospectus of a new company registered under the Limited Liability Acts, and every invitation to take shares in such new company, shall contain a

declaration in the following form: 'The official promoter of this company is [full name, address, and occupation], who is alone responsible for the accuracy of all the statements herein made, and for the omission, if any, of material facts. The directors and officers of the company are not responsible for any such statement or omission, and only undertake to manage the company's affairs, to the best of their ability, in the event of the capital, for which subscriptions are invited by the official promoter, being subscribed and allotted.'

No director or officer of any company, in whose prospectus the above declaration has been inserted, shall be responsible to any person taking shares in such company for any loss arising out of the misstatement or omission of any material fact or contract in the prospectus, unless such director or officer has knowingly and wilfully become a party to such misstatement or omission with intent to defraud.

Doubts have been expressed, among others by Judge Emden in his article in the December number of this Review, as to whether the increased risks and liabilities of directors, especially under the Directors' Liability Act, 1890, do really deter honest and substantial men from becoming first directors of good companies. Almost any company solicitor or City man could have told the judge how serious a difficulty it is to get the right men to accept these risks, a difficulty not likely to be diminished by the new Act. Indeed Judge Emden himself, on page 960, remarks, 'The old and respected firms, the true-bred merchants, are going, and ornamental directors are too often taking their place.' Precisely; and why? Because the substantial merchant does not care for holding office on the principle of 'Heads you win, tails I lose.' He does not see why if the venture succeeds the shareholders should take the profit, and if it fails the directors should bear the loss. So far as actual fraud is concerned, the honest director may well trust himself to the average judge and jury, but the doctrine of constructive legal fraud by which he is made liable for the omission of a material fact or a material contract from the prospectus is a most dangerous one. The history of 'constructive' crime in English jurisprudence might well serve as a warning. 'Constructive' treason is responsible for some of the worst judicial murders which disgrace our past. 'Constructive' murder has become such a scandal that one judge has courageously refused to try such cases, and has invited a Grand Jury to throw out bills of indictment for this crime; while 'constructive' obscenity in a well-known case led a judge into a definition which, logically, subjects to a criminal prosecution the sale of the Bible and of Shakespeare's works.

High judicial authorities assure us that the honest director need fear nothing from legislation against 'constructive' fraud, and that it should not deter the right men from accepting the post of director. If all judges and juries were infallible in their judgments upon law and facts, and if it were practicable for the ordinary business man to ascertain without doubt what is the law upon any given set of circumstances, this might be so. That our judges are

absolutely upright and incorrupt we all believe, that most of them know a good deal of law we humbly trust, though our confidence would be greater if they did not so continually upset each other's decisions. But when they assume that the plain business layman can possibly form any reliable decision, even with the help of his solicitors and 'counsel's opinion,' as to what the law will say in a given case, we can only follow Lord Westbury's example, and 'hold up our hands in respectful amazement.'

We have seen a majority of the judges rule that a betting ring is not a place used for betting, 'within the meaning of the Act.' Some twenty years ago or more, an attempt was made to introduce into this country the very useful French system of partnership '*en commandité*'—an application of the principle of limited liability to private partnerships and firms, whereby a sleeping partner may invest a fixed sum in a business, and receive a share of profits, without incurring liability beyond the sum advanced. For small concerns, this system is better adapted than the somewhat cumbersome organisation of a joint stock company, and under proper regulation might well displace many of the small limited companies that now choke the Register at Somerset House. Unfortunately our usual illogical system of legislation by reference and amendment was adopted, in place of framing a proper code of regulations in a complete Act.

'The Partnership Law Amendment Act' simply provided that when a person lent capital to a firm, receiving a share of profits instead of interest, he should not be held liable to outside creditors as a partner (beyond the amount advanced) by reason of his receiving a share of the profits.

The Act was made use of in a few instances, but before long a case came into the Courts in which a firm who had borrowed money under the Act had failed. A creditor sued the lender as a partner, and as such liable for the debts of the firm in full. The Act was pleaded, but the judge made short work of it. 'Oh! nonsense,' he said in effect, 'a man who shares profits is a partner, and there's an end of it.' Far be it from me to say he was wrong, but to the layman the decision seemed as diametrically opposed to the express words of the Act as it possibly could be. But the 'uncertainty of the law' is proverbial, and we business men know very well, and are often frankly told by our solicitors, that it is better to suffer almost any loss or wrong than to go to law about it. Unfortunately a defendant has no choice, and if the directors of an unsuccessful company are to be set up as 'cockshies' for any cantankerous shareholder, with an enterprising solicitor to sue under this cover of 'constructive fraud,' they cannot be sure of anything except that, whether they win or lose, they will be put to indefinite trouble and expense.

Here is a case within my personal knowledge. A shareholder in a mining company, being pressed for his calls, sued the company (not the directors) for rectification of the register, to have his name taken off, and the calls already paid refunded, on the ground of fraudulent misrepresentation in the prospectus. The funny part of the case was that every single statement in the prospectus, albeit a rather sanguine and highly coloured one, had been fully verified and borne out at the time the action was brought; but, as the official reports and plans of the manager were not legal evidence, the only way to disprove the allegations of the plaintiff would be to send out a commission to an out-of-the-way place in a distant country to examine the manager and the mine on the spot.

The delay and expense of such a commission and the inconvenience of having an action of the kind pending against the company for many months would have been so great that, although the plaintiff had not a leg, or even a toe, to stand upon, the directors were advised to compromise the action. 'Had it been brought against their predecessors (who issued the prospectus) personally, the latter would have been obliged to fight the case out at enormous cost or submit to an imputation of fraud. Here was an allegation of actual misrepresentation, quite unfounded; and it is bad enough to be subjected to such attacks. But recent legislation threatens to open the way to innumerable charges of 'constructive' fraud which, however inequitable, it may be most difficult and troublesome to repel.'

So far as a business man can hope to understand the law, a director appears to be liable to refund to a shareholder the amount invested by the latter, not merely if there be an actual misrepresentation of fact in the prospectus, but if there be an omission of a 'material' fact or contract, and the criterion of what is 'material' appears to be that it might affect the mind of the shareholder in deciding to apply for shares.

But how on earth am I to know what will or will not affect the mind of another man? Personally I am not disposed to think well of a concern when the prospectus deals largely in red ink and black letter type, but apparently these features are attractive to some people. But that is not all. I have to consider not only what I think may affect the mind of an investor; but what a judge and a jury (possibly innocent as babes of technical knowledge) may think that another man would think about the matter.

In considering a draft prospectus, therefore, a director, A, has to consider first what he thinks himself to be material; secondly, what B, an intending investor, may think material; thirdly, what C, a judge, and D, E, F, &c., jurymen, may think that B ought to think material.

If A loses his way in this labyrinth, he does so, mind, at the risk of his whole fortune.

Now anyone who has tried to draft a prospectus, say, for a mining company, or to compare the draft with the data on which it is founded, knows how difficult it is to select from a mass of documents, reports, leases, plans, sections, estimates, &c., the facts he himself thinks material, to say nothing of deciding what B and the rest of the alphabet may think material. To begin with, only a mining expert can really say whether many of the facts are 'material,' and as to some of them probably no two experts would agree. The average non-technical man has no chance of deciding for himself. Not long ago the chairman of a gold-mining company in the Transvaal joyfully announced at a meeting of the shareholders that the manager had reported the presence of copper in the ore which, at the present high price of copper, the chairman thought a 'material fact' in favour of the company. The poor man was quite unaware that the copper in ores of the class he referred to is merely an expensive nuisance, increasing the cost of 'cyaniding' and lowering the fineness of the bullion, and so a 'material' fact in quite the opposite sense.

If directors endeavour to evade the difficulty by publishing all documents in full, nobody will wade through them. If they do their best to select, under expert advice, the 'material facts,' they run the risk of having to make good the whole capital subscribed for an unsuccessful mine, because they omitted to state some technical detail which a judge and jury who know nothing practically of the business may think to have been material.

Why should the committee of management take all this risk in favour of their fellow-shareholders? Surely the proper persons to bear it are the vendors who are paid for their property on the faith of its being what it is represented to be.

No doubt much of what has been said as to the difficulty of deciding what is 'material' applies to the 'official promoters' also; but they have better means of knowing all the facts than directors can have, and moreover, if they have to make good losses by investors, they are only refunding what they have wrongly received, whereas directors are asked to pay losses out of their own pockets.

Another curious misconception which seems to pervade the legal mind, and has given rise to the 'golden rule,' as Judge Emden calls it, that companies shall not issue shares at a discount, is the notion that a share is, or stands for, a sum of money, whereas it is a 'fractional interest.' A share, as its very name implies, cannot be issued at a discount, although it may be issued for a price below its nominal value. You cannot issue the tenth share of a concern as a fifth or a twentieth share, and if you could, which of these would be an issue at a discount? A 'share' need not necessarily have any nominal

value. You might divide an undertaking into 100,000 shares of no fixed denomination, but each entitled to $\frac{1}{100000}$ of the assets and profits. If you did this, you might sell a portion of the shares at first for a small price, and if the concern increased in value you might sell the remainder at an increased price; on the contrary, if the concern decreased in value, you might sell the remainder at a lower price. Why not? $\frac{1}{100000}$ share of the concern is still $\frac{1}{100000}$ whether you sell it for 5s. or 5l. This is the American system of mining shares, only there the share is called a dollar share, not because it is supposed to represent a dollar, but because, a dollar containing 100 cents, this method affords a convenient way of comparing the relative prices of the shares at different times. Moreover, it is more convenient to speak of a dollar share than of $\frac{1}{100000}$ or $\frac{1}{1000000}$, as the case may be.

With us 1l. is found to be the convenient unit, and we speak of five 1l. shares, for example, in a company with a capital of 150,000l., when what we really mean is a 'fractional interest' of $\frac{5}{150000}$ in the concern, which does not necessarily represent 5l., but may represent 5d., or 5s., or 50l. I am not just now contending that there may not be reasons for forbidding the issue of shares at a price less than their nominal value, except under certain conditions. What I am concerned to show is that there is nothing whatever immoral or improper or contrary to the essential idea of a 'share' in such a proceeding. Indeed the holy horror with which certain financial purists speak of this practice is rather comic, when one remembers that Parliament itself not only permits in certain cases of railways the 'issue of shares at a discount,' but has sanctioned what to some people appears much worse—the wholesale watering of stock by converting railway stock on which 100l. has been paid into 200l. of stock; that is, issuing stock at a discount of 50 per cent. Our immaculate Chancellor of the Exchequer when he issues 100l. of Consols for 98l. does the very same thing.

This question of the real meaning of a 'share' has an important bearing upon the case of underwriting, which Judge Emden would apparently do away with altogether. His statement that 'a company with a solid undertaking does not need any underwriting' is an illustration of how little practical knowledge may underlie the dicta of high legal authority.

There are two main reasons why underwriting is indispensable to our present system of joint stock companies. In the first place, good directors will not allow their names to be associated with an undertaking which may be a failure as regards the subscription of capital, and there is no way of assuring a successful issue of a new company except by a guarantee; that is, by underwriting. The caprice of the public investor is so great that no human being can tell beforehand how a new issue may be received. • That this is so is

proved by the number of cases in which underwriters, who base their transaction entirely on the belief that the public will subscribe the issue, find themselves 'stuck,' as the phrase goes, with 50, 70, or 90 per cent. of the shares they have underwritten:

The other reason is that, thanks chiefly to our legislators and lawyers, it costs from 5,000*l.* to 7,000*l.* merely to invite subscriptions to a company of moderate capital, and that if the issue is a failure somebody has to bear this loss. That somebody naturally will not provide this amount of cash unless he is assured that the company will go to allotment and recoup him. This assurance can only be given by obtaining a guarantee from substantial persons that if the public do not take up the shares the guarantors will. For giving this guarantee they receive a commission, the effect of which undoubtedly is that, if they have to take up part of the shares, they obtain them at a less price than the public investor pays for them. But they give a *quid pro quo* in two ways: they lock up their money for a time in shares they do not want in order to complete the insufficient capital subscribed by the public, and they forego the chance of a premium, which, if the public issue is a success, the public investor has the opportunity of realising. The disapproval of underwriting, apart from the academic objection to the so-called 'issue of shares at a discount,' appears to rest on the idea that the underwriting commission comes out of the pocket of the investor, and this idea is embodied in the Act of 1900 which speaks of applying the capital money or 'shares of the company indirectly through the vendor to the payment of underwriting commissions. This is another instance of failure to recognise facts as they are. A mine, for example, may have little or no value while undeveloped and unworked, but may have great potential value if capital is provided for this purpose. The owner may reckon with himself, for instance, that with 50,000*l.* working capital, his mine will return an adequate interest upon 150,000*l.*, and this, in passing, is really the only practical method of valuing a mine. The mine is therefore worth to the company 100,000*l.* to buy, if 50,000*l.* capital is provided. If this 50,000*l.* dropped from the skies, the owner might pocket his 100,000*l.* and go off contented.

But he knows that to find this 50,000*l.*, and especially to guarantee it, will require skill, influence, connection which he does not possess, and also the expenditure of considerable sums in cash. He therefore argues that, as the mine is no good to him without capital, it is worth his while to give up a part of the value which will be conferred upon his property by the provision of capital to the persons who can get it provided, *i.e.* to the promoters. But this share of the value does not come out of the investor's pocket at all, but out of the vendor's. What the investor has to look to is to see that the share of the total profit which the working capital is to

receive is a fair one. It is nothing to him how the vendor's share is divided, whether he gives away half, or all, or none. The Act of 1900 has surely made an extraordinary precedent in legislation by professing to decree how the vendor of a property shall dispose of his purchase money. Neither the articles of association, nor the prospectus, nor the directors, can prevent the vendor, so far as I can see, from paying any commission he pleases to guarantors of the capital. This part of the Act seems altogether ill-drawn and ill-considered.

The Act has done one or two good things. By requiring a fixed minimum subscription before allotment, it checks one great cause of failure, viz. commencing business upon insufficient capital; and by requiring practically the disclosure of all dealings with the property for three years previous to the issue of the prospectus, it should put a stop to the scandalous increase of the original price of properties by transfers from hand to hand of which we have had striking instances disclosed lately. The absurd 38th clause of the Act of 1867 is substituted by a more rational provision.

On the other hand, by the cumbersome, complicated, and often unintelligible provisions of the new Act, fresh pitfalls are provided for the honest director, who is thus further discouraged in favour of the irresponsible guinea pig. Most of the real causes of the failure of companies, particularly mining companies, are unaffected by the Act, partly because some of them are intangible by legislation, partly because the framers of the Act have no real knowledge of these causes, and do not seem to care to learn them. It is especially disheartening to find that a high legal authority like Judge Emden, who has evidently taken great interest in the subject and with whose objects in this matter all honest men sympathise, can devote an article of sixteen pages to the matter without having acquired more practical knowledge of the causes of failure and the possible remedies.

The discussion of these causes and remedies must be deferred to some other occasion.

R. GERVASE ELWES, M.Inst.C.E.

ROBERT BROWNING THE MUSICIAN

What's poetry except a power that makes
 And speaking to one sense, inspires the rest,
 Pressing them all into its service, so
 That who sees painting seems to hear as well
 The speech that's proper for the painted mouth;
 And who hears music, feels his solitude
 Peopled at once.—*Balaustion's Adventure.*

IN the history of mankind there have surely been few men endowed with such gifts, or even with such promise, that they might fairly ask themselves, in early life, 'Shall I train myself to become a poet, an artist, or a musician?'

Such a one, however, was Robert Browning, and though, owing partly to choice and partly to circumstance, the poet in him triumphed, the others were not lost. The poet, as such, made abundant use of his knowledge of art and music in his own characteristic manner; seldom, indeed, as the subjects of poetry, but frequently as accessories in the dramatic background.

Browning has himself shown us his canon of poetic structure in the often quoted preface to *Stordello*, a poem which, it will be remembered, appeared originally in 1840, being preceded only by *Pauline* (1833) and *Paracelsus* (1835), and which may therefore be regarded as expressing a standard which he placed before himself at an early stage of his poetic career.

'The historical decoration was purposely of no more importance than a background requires, and my stress lay on the incidents in the development of a soul; little else is worth study.' It is as contributing to that development that the background is worth study too. It is, after all, a part of the mighty whole. The background to the soul is life and its mysteries, time and its labours, humanity and its passions, and the poet's voice is never so loud nor so clear as in the interpretation of whatever sets forth these.

Browning never gives us what Gray has so well called 'the lowest degree of poetry, namely the descriptive'; but our appreciation of the loneliness of James Lee's wife is deepened by the wailing wind and the barren shore; and the

Infinite passion, and the pain
 Of finite hearts that yearn,

come to us with all the more significance, borne upon the silence of the Campagna, with its 'endless fleece of feathery grasses,' and its 'everlasting wash of air.'

Shelley has been called 'the poet of poets.' Robert Browning is surely the poet of musicians. A few scenes in Shakespeare, a few lines in Milton, a single poem of Rossetti, comprise nearly all that has been uttered by the greater English poets about music. The odes of Pope or Dryden or Collins, whatever their merits from other points of view, are no more sympathetic to the true musician than are the 'descriptive pieces' of music which have but lately ceased to be a terror in our drawing-rooms. No other poet has presented music in what is surely its highest aspects, that of a means of expression, as poetry is a means of expression, of the soul's deepest communings with itself. Browning, in short, uses poetry as only the musician can. He was, we know, a performer on the piano, but he was far more. He was no mere 'man of music . . . with notes, and nothing else, to say.'

Mrs. Ireland has told us how Browning said to her, 'You have been writing on my poem *A Toccata of Galuppi's*, and that's very interesting to me. as I was learning the grammar of music when other little boys were learning their multiplication table'; and Mrs. Sutherland Orr, in giving an account of his education, tells us:

The study of music was also serious, and carried on under two masters; Mr. John Relfe ['master of mine, learned, redoubtable'], author of a valuable book on counterpoint, was his instructor in thorough bass; Mr. Abel, a pupil of Moscheles, in execution. He wrote music for songs which he himself sang, among them Donne's *Go and catch a falling star*; Hood's *I will not have the mad Clytie*; Peacock's *The mountain sheep are sweeter*; and his settings, all of which he subsequently destroyed, were, I am told, very spirited.

Browning tells us in his *Parleyings with Certain People* (1887), how he came to select for discourse Charles Avison, organist of Newcastle:

Singly and solely for an air of thine
Bold stepping 'March,' foot stepped to ere my hand
Could stretch an octave.

And on this 'Grand March' he hangs much argument as to the place of music in the interpretation of the emotions.

But the great musical influence of his life seems to have been his early friendship with that gifted woman, Eliza Flower—like himself, in her degree, a poet and a musician—a friendship which, as Mrs. Bridell Fox, the intimate friend of both, has testified, profoundly modified his life.

About 1824, when Robert Browning was twelve years old, he conceived a boyish passion for this beautiful girl, nine years his senior.

¹ *The Last Ride Together*, viii.

The occasion was one, in itself, of deep interest. He was then, as we may readily suppose, in the 'Byronic stage'—the Shelley worship had not begun—and the immediate result was the production of a volume of short poems which he called *Incondita*, and for which, naturally, no publisher could be found. His mother showed the volume to her acquaintance, Miss Flower, whose admiration was so great as to induce her to copy the poems to show to her friend, Mr. W. J. Fox, in whose possession it remained till his death, when, his daughter, Mrs. Bridell Fox, tells me, she herself restored it to the poet at his own request.

One must have a keen recollection of the early teens, when one wrote verses, to realise all that such sympathy meant for a boy sensitive, full of ambition, leading a retired suburban life. Miss Flower's interest in the young poet led also to that of Mr. Fox, the friend to whom he wrote in 1833, the year of the publication of *Pauline*, 'I can only offer you my simple thanks, but they are of the sort that one can give only once or twice in a lifetime. . . . I shall never write a line without thinking of the source of my first praise, be assured.'

An intimacy was soon established with the family of Mr. Fox, in whose household the Misses Flower (to whom, since their father's death in 1829, he had acted as guardian) were permanent residents. Mrs. Bridell Fox gives us a charming picture of a day in her own childhood—the 7th of May, 1835—when, her elders being out, she, a shy little girl, received young Robert Browning alone in her father's drawing-room.

'It's my birthday to-day,' he explained; 'I'll wait till they come in. If it won't disturb you, I'll play till they do.'

We can fancy him, as he sat there, in all the charm of his twenty-three years, waiting for the musician whose music was so dear to him, pleasing and careful (Mrs. Bridell Fox hints a little over-careful) in his dress, playing perhaps in the fashion Mrs. Blomfield Moore² has described for us:

He possessed the gift of improvising on the piano. To listen was to be entranced as by the rapt strains of Beethoven's compositions, or by Mendelssohn's glorious melodies, as the poet's hands swept the keys, passing from one theme to another; but you could listen only once to the same strains; the inspiration came and went; the poet could never repeat his melodies. Few there were who knew of this divine gift; for only to those who were most intimate with him did he reveal himself in this way.

During this period of his friendship with the Flowers he must have lived in the very atmosphere of music. Eliza and Sarah Flower are the heroines of Miss Martineau's story *Five Years of*

² *Lippincott's Magazine*, 1889-90.

Youth, and among various pictures which help to vivify our interest in these early friends of Robert Browning is this of the way in which music pervaded the household.

Mary [whom we may take as equivalent to Eliza Flower] had been well taught, but she had that natural taste for music—the ear and the soul for it—without which no teaching is of any avail. She sang much and often, not because she had any particular aim at being accomplished, but because she loved it, or, as she said, because she could not help it. She sang to Nurse Rickham's children, she sang as she went up and down stairs; she sang when she was glad and when she was sorry, and when her papa was at home because he liked it; when he was out, because he could not be disturbed by it. In the woods at noonday she sang like a bird, that a bird might answer her; and if she woke in the dark night, the feeling of solemn music came over her with which she dared not break the silence. Everything suggested music to her. Every piece of poetry which she understood and liked formed itself into melody in her mind without an effort; when a gleam of sunshine burst out she gave voice to it; and long before she had heard any cathedral service the chaunting of the Psalms was familiar to her by anticipation.

Such was the musician whose friendship was a part of Browning's life for twenty years, to whom he wrote on her deathbed in 1845, ten years later:

I never had another feeling than entire admiration for your music—entire admiration. I put it apart from all other English music I know, and fully believe in it as *the* music we all waited for.

Of your health I shall not trust myself to speak; you must know what is unspoken. I should have been most happy to see you if but for a minute—and if next Wednesday I might take your hand for a moment. . . . But you would concede that, if it were right, remembering what is now a very old friendship.

May God bless you for ever.

Mrs. Sutherland Orr tells us that even in latest life

he never mentioned Eliza Flower's name with indifference, . . . and if, in spite of his denials, any woman inspired *Pauline*, it can have been no other than she. . . . What he afterwards called 'the few utterly insignificant scraps of letters and verse which formed part of his correspondence,' were preserved by her as long as she lived. But he recovered and destroyed them after his return to England, with all other reminiscences of those early years.

It would be indeed difficult not to see some reference to Miss Flower and her music in the following passages in *Pauline*, written, it is to be remembered, in 1833, when his intimacy with her was at its height. Mrs. Bridell Fox, who remembers vividly each circumstance of this period of Browning's frequent visits to her father's house, where he made one of a brilliant group whose names are familiar to us all, assures me that she can feel no question on this point. The passages are their own best testimony.

Pauline, my soul's friend, thou dost pity yet
How this mood swayed me when that soul found thine,
When I had set myself to live this life
Defying all past glory. Ere thou camest
I seemed defiant, sweet, for old delights

but his love for music was as certainly starved as the delight in painting and sculpture was nourished; and it had now grown into a passion from the indulgence of which he derived, as he always declared, some of the most beneficent influences of his life. It would be scarcely an exaggeration to say that he attended every important concert of the season, whether isolated or given in a course. There was no engagement, possible or actual, which did not yield to the discovery of its clashing with the day and hour fixed for one of these.

Possibly music was the one pursuit in regard to which Elizabeth Barrett Browning could not share her husband's interest. Certainly nothing in her poems would lead us to suppose an original taste for music, and one painful line would suggest that she did not even understand its terminology:

We beat the phorminx till we hurt our thumbs,
As though still ignorant of *counterpoint*:

counterpoint having about as much connection with musical execution as the science of perspective with the art of mixing colours!

With his boy's musical education Browning took considerable personal trouble. Mrs. Bridell Fox has told me of Sunday morning visits to their house in Florence, when Mrs. Browning would be curled up in a corner of her sofa in the drawing-room, while from an inner room would come sounds of childish practising, with occasional corrections and accompaniments thundered out in the poet's firm bass. One story of this period is—to the musician—absolutely pathetic in its suggestions: a story of Mrs. Browning saying to her husband just as he was closing the piano after, perhaps, some musical dream of his own, 'Why did you stop?' Here is Penini just come with his two drums to accompany you!' One wonders whether the father or the musician triumphed upon that occasion!

True man as he was, Browning was conscious of his own limitations. In one of the few poems in which he permits himself to speak, his *One Word More*, addressed to his wife, he says:

I shall never, in the years remaining,
Paint you pictures, no, nor carve you statues,
Make you music that should all-express me;
So it seems: I stand on my attainment,
This of verse alone, one life allows me;
Verse and nothing else have I to give you.

Without hoping, then, to find that Browning has attempted to use his knowledge of music otherwise than as a background for 'incidents in the development of a soul,' let us briefly glance at the use to which, in his poetry, his special knowledge of the art and science of music has been put.

We have, to begin with, a number of casual allusions to music, instances in which music serves as illustration, rather from the poet's familiarity with the subject, than because of its obviousness or special appropriateness, as in *Waring*, *The Last Ride*, *Christmas Eve*, &c.

Browning's use for illustration or background of what, in other hands, might be the mere technicalities of music, might be abundantly illustrated. For example,

And as some long lost moan
Of a minor suddenly is propped beneath
By note, which, new struck, turns the wail that was
Into a wonder and a triumph, so
Began Alkestis. (*Balaustion*.)

Or again,

And music; what? that burst of pillared cloud by day
And pillared fire by night, was product must we say,
Of modulating just, by enharmonic change,—
The augmented sixth resolved—from out the straighter range
Of D sharp minor—leap of disimprisoned thrall,—
Into thy life and light D major natural? (*Balaustion*.)

A striking instance, selected, almost at random, from a great number of possible examples showing the close relation of music, colour, form and emotion in the poet's mind, is this from *Charles Avison*. Avison is regarded by the public, says Browning, as cold and dead in style, whereas he merely lacked the mechanical means of expression—'modern appliance.' Give that, and

I sprinkle my reactives, pitch broadcast
Discords and resolutions, turn aghast
Melody's easy-going, jostle law
With licence, modulate (no Bach in awe),
Change enharmonically (Hudl to thank),
And so, upstart the flamelets,—what was blank
Turns scarlet, purple, crimson. . . .
Love once more
Yearns through the Largo, Hatred as before
Rages in the Rubato.

Or again, in *Fine at the Fair*, where we have a description of Schumann's victories over the commonplace, involving the technical difficulties all executants know so well. 'I somehow, nohow, played the pretty piece,' says Browning.

Music, again, is made to serve as an accessory, a hint of local colour, as in the 'plagal cadence' of the *Heretic's Tragedy*, or the chanted march time of the *Grammarian's Funeral*.

Or, again, we have the musician's recognition of some esoteric meaning in what, to the poet only, might have been the mere artistic recognition of the beautiful. Take, for example, in *A Lovers' Quarrel*:

Here's the spring back, or close
When the almond-blossom blows;
We shall have the word
In a minor third
There is none but the cuckoo knows.

Or in *A Serenade at the Villa* :

Singing helped the verses best,
And when singing's best was done,
To my lute I left the rest.

We need not dwell on Browning's use of music as a power; on its influence on the imagination as in *The Pied Piper*, or upon evil as in *Saul*, or even in the teaching of such a soul-lesson as in *Youth and Art*. It is not in such uses as these that the poet takes his real stand as a musician. Real and vital as music was to Browning, we have a right to expect that for him it was a means of the expression of his highest thought. 'Browning's voice,' Henry James has said, 'sounds loudest and clearest for the things which as a race we like best—the fascination of faith, the acceptance of life, the respect for its mysteries, the endurance of its changes, the vitality of the will, the validity of character, the beauty of action, the seriousness, above all, of the great human passion.'

For most of us—for the women among us, at all events—the true greatness of Browning as a teacher consists in his intense *manliness*, his intense humanness; he is a man of like passions with ourselves, to whom the *whole* of life 'means intensely and means good'; every factor counts in the great sum, is an opportunity for development and progress. Man's nature is to be purified, his passions directed, subjected to the control of reason; but the mere ascetic who subtracts from the sum of his virility does an injustice to himself, deducts from the potentialities which are a part of his means of development here.

That what began best can't end worst,
Nor what God blessed once, prove accurst.

That it is in his entirety, body, soul, and spirit, that God made man in His own image.

Is it very fanciful to find in the three great music poems of Browning, *Abt Vogler*, *Master Hugues of Saxe Gotha*, and *A Toccata of Galuppi's*, an indication of some sequence of teaching such as this? In the last the tone is purely sensuous; the suggestions of the music are æsthetic, the pictures of the pleasure-loving old Venice, the warm sea, the balls and masks, the beauty of the women,

While you sat and played Toccatas, stately at the Clavichord.

The very technicalities are suggestive of æsthetic images, of beauty and pleasure :

What! those lesser thirds so plaintive, sixths diminished sigh on sigh
'Told them something? Those suspensions, those solutions, Must we die?
'Those commiserating sevenths—' Life might last, we can but try!
'Were you happy?'—'Yes.'—'And are you still as happy?' 'Yes, and you?'
'Then, more kisses.' 'Did I stop them, when a million seemed so few?'
Hark! the dominant's persistence till it must be answered to!

It is the mere body of music in which the soul has never waked, gay, beautiful, frivolous with the ghastly frivolity and hollowness of decay; the very rhythm of the lines suggestive of the tinkling clavi-chord, lacking in richness of harmony and depth.

Dust and ashes, dead and done with, Venice spent what Venice earned;
The soul doubtless is immortal, where a soul can be discerned.

Let us pass on to the poem of *Master Hugues of Saxe Gotha*. Him too the poet questions, as he questioned Galuppi, but this time the problem is purely intellectual:

What do you mean by your mountainous fugues?

The music of the poem is the music of *attainment*, the music of science, the mental exercise which the musician loves as such; whereby he strengthens and develops the more transcendental powers which call out Music's innermost soul. Browning loves the fugue, and refers to this form of composition again and again in *Charles Avison* and elsewhere. The poem is a *tour de force*. To the ordinary poet it would be almost as easy to express a problem of Euclid in verse as the construction of a fugue.

First you deliver your phrase,
Nothing propound, that I see,
Fit in itself for much blame or much praise,
Answered no less, where no answer needs be.
Off start the two on their ways.
Straight must a Third interpose,
Volunteer needlessly help,
In strikes a Fourth, a Fifth thrusts in his nose.

And so on. But music, he recognises, should be more than mere 'tiring three boys at the bellows.'

Is it your moral of life—backward and forward each throwing his shuttle?

The question receives no adequate answer, the mere intellect does not suffice for the interpretation. The lights in the church are extinguished even while he is working out the problem; as with Hamlet, the mystery remains, the rest is silence. We must return to first principles:

Blare out the mode Palestrina,
Simplest and earliest of all.

Lastly we come to the great musical triumph of Browning's genius, *Abt Vogler*, the poem in which he wrote of the heaven of music as Dante wrote of the Paradiso—as one who has been there:

'Tis we musicians know.

'If the Shakespeare of music—Beethoven—had written a poem,' Lowell has said, 'it would have been such as *Abt Vogler*.'

The Abbé Vogler has been called the *bête noire* of Mozart and the guardian angel of Weber; all that he was we shall never know, for his great gift was that of extemporisation, but the truth

and the meaning of the poem depend little on historical association, interesting though that may be. He was a master of harmony rather than of melody, and Beethoven himself could not sleep for excitement after hearing his playing on the organ. He was a musical iconoclast, a man of aspiration in whom a divine discontent led to revolutionary attacks on the pedantry and conventionality of his age. The poem supposes him to be extemporising on an instrument of his own invention, but, like David when he played in the presence of Saul, he is seer as well as musician.

This is the poem of *soul*, the music of spiritual transcendentalism; it is a vision of the infinite, a revelation of the supersensuous; a human soul agonising in the passion of aspiration.

As in the other poems we have discussed, the language is adapted to the thought. Poet and musician alike speak not merely to the sense or to the intellect, but to *the all of emotion* which man holds most sacred.

The figure with which it opens marks the distinction—we have no mere aggregation of sound as in the ‘mountainous fugue’ of Master Hugues; we have a beautiful dream-building mounting higher and higher—

Up the pinnacled glory reached and the pride of my soul was in sight.

There is no limit to the powers of evocation which music possesses; earth and heaven meet, presences yet unborn, the future yet unnamed are there, mingling with the

Wonderful dead who have passed thro’ the body and gone,
But were back once more to breathe in an old world worth their new.

And then he dwells on the *miracle* of music; it is apart from law, as it is apart from time and space. Fragile and ephemeral as it seems, it comes from God, with Whom is the eternal Now.

Like the other musicians we have seen, so Abt Vogler has his questionings. Is it *failure*, this good that comes and goes like music, and leaves no sign? On the contrary,

All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist,
Not its semblance but itself; no beauty, nor good, nor power
Whose voice has gone forth but each survives for the melodist
When eternity affirms the conception of an hour. . . .
. . . I feel for the common chord again
Sliding by semitones, till I sink to the minor—yes.
And I blunt it into a ninth and I stand on alien ground
Surveying awhile the heights I rolled from into the deep,
Which, hark! I have dared and done, for my resting place is found,
The C major of this life; so now I will try to sleep.

The return to the C major, ‘the bold C major’ as he elsewhere
VOL. XLIX—No. 290

Y Y

puts it,¹ to life in such a key as best befits 'each day's most quiet heed,' as his poet-wife has called ^o 'the trivial round, the common task,' this is the lesson which the genius of Browning, poet, artist, and musician, has constantly affirmed.

How we Feel, hard and fast as what we Know,
This were the prize and is the puzzle! which
Music essays to solve.

A. GOODRICH-FREER.

¹ Compare too:

'Clash forth life's common chord, whence list how there ascend
Harmonies far and faint, till our perception end,—
Reverberated notes whence we construct the scale
Embracing what we know and feel we are!'—*Fine*, i. xii.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA MAXIMA

If the siege of the Peking Legations had no other claim to be remembered, it would always be associated in the minds of those interested in Chinese studies with one of the most appalling literary catastrophes the world has ever seen. The utter destruction by fire of the entire book-quarter, containing not only vast stores of modern books with their wooden blocks (=stereotype plates), from which fresh issues are printed, but also large numbers of rare old editions long since out of print and almost unprocureable, would alone form a very sufficient disaster. Even this, however, is a small matter compared with the burning of the Han-lin College and all its priceless contents.

Before going any farther, it may be as well to note that these two calamities were both brought about by direct acts of the Chinese themselves. The former was caused by the Boxers, who fired various shops in the Chinese city where foreign goods were sold; and in the latter case, Chinese soldiers, presumably under orders, set fire to the Han-lin College, in the hope that the flames might catch on to the British Legation adjoining.

The origin of the Han-lin College is lost in the mists of antiquity. With the first rude efforts in the domain of Chinese historiography this department of State may be said to have come into existence. Its modern name dates only from the eighth century A.D., some time between 713 and 738.

In 1421, when the Mings transferred their capital from Nanking to Peking (where it has remained ever since), the Han-lin College was placed within the Imperial City; but in 1442 it was removed to a building just outside, which under the Mongols had been the Court of State Ceremonial, a kind of Lord Chamberlain's Office, now popularly known as 'the Drowsy Department.' For more than four centuries and a half the College has been always upon the same spot, its members, chosen from the most brilliant among China's rising graduates, occupied among other duties in compiling the *Veritable Record* of each sovereign's reign, which may become public property only after the final extinction of the dynasty, and also in writing the biographies of any eminent public servants on whom this honour has been conferred. Among these will be found the names

of true patriots such as Tséng Kuo-fan and (we may hope) Chang Chih-tung; among these, too, is the name of Ch'ên Kuo-jui, who for want of other recommendation must be considered to have rendered good service to the Manchu dynasty as the unpunished instigator of the Tientsin Massacre on the 21st of June, 1870.

The *Veritable Records*, at any rate for the present dynasty, have probably perished beyond recall. Those of the Ming dynasty, which ended in 1644, are of course safe. A copy of the latter, in eighty-four large volumes, perhaps the only copy in Europe, stands upon the shelves of the Cambridge University Library. Of far more immediate value than records which may never see the light was the priceless encyclopædia which shared in the ruin of the Han-lin College, and to which this article has special reference.

In 1403, the third Emperor of the Ming dynasty, commonly known by his year-title as Yung Lo, one of the most energetic monarchs of Chinese history, issued a commission to Hsieh Chin, the leading scholar of the day, for the preparation of an encyclopædia. With the assistance of 146 colleagues, Hsieh Chin finished his work in a year and four months, and laid it before the Throne. This book received the name of *Wên Hsien Ta Ch'êng*, or *Complete Record of Literature*; but when His Majesty came to look into it, he found that Hsieh Chin had altogether misunderstood his instructions as to the scale on which the compilation was to be made. The Emperor thereupon issued a new commission, in which Hsieh Chin appears as one of three Commissioners, with five Directors, twenty sub-Directors, and a staff of 2,141 assistants, making 2,169 persons in all. His Majesty's idea was to collect together in a single work all that had ever been written in the four departments of (1) the Confucian Canon, (2) history, (3) philosophy, and (4) general literature, including astronomy, geography, cosmogony, medicine, divination, Buddhism, Taoism, handicrafts, and arts; and by the end of 1407 or the beginning of 1408 a compilation was submitted to the Sacred Glance which immediately received the stamp of Imperial approval, and was named the *Yung Lo Ta Tien*—that is, the *Great Standard of Yung Lo*.

This work, over which so many scholars had spent first and last some five years, ran to no fewer than 22,877 separate sections, to which must be added an index occupying sixty sections. The whole was bound up in 11,100 volumes, each half an inch in thickness; so that, were all the volumes laid flat one upon another, the column thus formed would reach a height of 450 feet, or nearly 46 feet higher than the top of St. Paul's.

The volumes are one foot eight inches in length by one foot in breadth. The binding consists of the usual pasteboard, covered with yellow silk, yellow being the Imperial colour. Each volume bears two labels outside; one of these gives the titles and the

numbers of the sections—sometimes only one—contained within ; the other gives the rhyme, according to the *Hung Wu Chêng Yün*, a rhyming dictionary issued during the reign of the first Emperor of the Ming dynasty and now almost forgotten, under which the entries are classified, together with a number which is probably a librarian's mark for purposes of arrangement.

Chinese not being an alphabetic language, it has always been a puzzle so to arrange the contents of dictionaries, encyclopædias, &c., that they may be available for easy reference by the student. This difficulty has been met in several ways. Dictionaries have been compiled by taking all characters with a common portion, and then arranging these in reference to the number of strokes in the remaining portion. It must first be laid down what and how many are to be regarded as common portions, and the number has varied in past times ; but it is now confined to 214, themselves arranged in groups determined by the number of strokes, which run from one stroke to seventeen strokes. This plan may be illustrated in English as follows, supposing for a moment all our words to occupy the position of Chinese characters. A lexicographer finding *acc* common to *account*, *accountable*, *acceptable*, *accord*, *accordingly*, *accommodate*, would arrange them thus :

..	Accord	=	Acc. + three strokes
	Account	=	„ + four strokes
	Acceptable	=	„ + seven strokes
	Accountable	}	= „ + eight strokes
	Accordingly		
	Accommodate		

The ordinary method of compiling an encyclopædia is to arrange its various entries under comprehensive categories, such as *Heaven*, which would include the sun, moon and stars, rain, snow, wind, &c. ; *Earth*, which would include geography, mineralogy, geomancy, &c. ; *Man* ; *Fauna* ; *Flora* ; and so on.

A third method, applicable to dictionaries and encyclopædias alike, is to arrange the particular words which form the headings in each case under their rhymes. Here, however, the Tones, of which there are four in the book-language, come into play ; and *bang* could not be a rhyme to *sang* unless both were read in the same tone or inflection of voice.

Each section of the *Yung Lo Ta Tien* contains about twenty leaves, making a total of 917,480 pages for the whole work, as against 22,000 in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Each page contains sixteen columns of characters, averaging twenty-five characters to each column, or a total of 366,992,000 characters. A comparison between this gigantic number and the total words in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* would be an unfair test of the relative amount of matter comprised

in the two works, for the simple reason that in the book-language of China condensation is pushed to limits never dreamt of even by Tacitus, all possible pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and particles generally being sacrificed to what the Chinese regard as style. The late Professor Legge declared that 100 Chinese characters were about equivalent to 130 English words; in view of which it is interesting to note that the *Encyclopædia Britannica* has 22,000 pages, 44,000 columns, (say) seventy lines to a column, and about ten words to a line = 30,800,000 words.

The next stage in what may fairly be called the tragedy of the *Yung Lo Ta Tien* is connected with the art of printing, which has been widely applied to the production of books in China ever since the tenth century A.D. Specimens of early Chinese printing are extremely rare. Professor Hirth, of Munich, gave in his *China and the Roman Orient* a facsimile of a page from the history of the later Han dynasty, printed in 1167, and the oldest printed book in the Cambridge Library is *An Account of Strange Nations*, with full-page illustrations, which dates from 1390. But that books were printed in the tenth century we know from many collateral sources. For instance, the *Yü Hai*, a very rare encyclopædia, of which the University of Leyden is fortunate enough to possess a perfect copy, has the following entry: 'In the third year of T'ai-p'ing Hsing-kuo, (A.D. 978) the *T'ai P'ing Kuan Chi* (a collection of extracts on all manner of curious topics) was completed, and in the sixth year of the same (A.D. 981) orders were given that it should be cut on blocks for printing.'

Accordingly, when the *Yung Lo Ta Tien* was completed the Emperor gave orders that it should be transcribed for printing. The process is, and always has been, the same all over China. Two consecutive pages of a book, separated by a column containing the title, number of section, and number of leaf, are written out and pasted face downwards on a block of wood (*Lindera tzü-mu*, Hemsl.). This paper, where not written upon, is cut away with sharp tools, leaving the characters in relief, and of course backwards, as in the case of European type. The block is then inked, and an impression is taken off, on one side of the paper only. This sheet is then folded down the middle of the separating column above mentioned, so that the blank halves come together, leaving two pages of printed matter outside; and when enough sheets have been brought together, they are stabbed at the open ends and form a volume, to be further wrapped in paper or pasteboard, and labelled with title, &c. It is almost superfluous to say that the pages of a Chinese book must not be cut. There is nothing inside, and, moreover, the column bearing the title and leaf number would be cut through. Sometimes the thin Chinese leaf is thickened and rendered more durable by the insertion of a blank sheet of soft and cheap paper. Occasionally unsold remainders are used for this purpose. One of the

Chinese works in the Cambridge Library is padded with the poems—*chartæ ineptæ*—of the great Emperor Ch'ien Lung.

To return. Within two years, that is to say by 1410, the work was ready for the block-cutter, but it was then discovered that the expense of carrying through the scheme was too serious to be faced, and the project was allowed to drop.

In 1421 the capital was removed from Nanking to Peking, where it has ever since remained; and the *Yung Lo Ta Tien* was also transferred, and stored in a pavilion belonging to the palace.

We do not again hear of it until 1562, when orders were issued for 100 scholars to make a copy and duplicate copy of the whole work, a task which was completed in 1567. The original was then sent back to Nanking; and of the copy and duplicate copy, the former was placed in a pavilion of the palace, the latter in the Office of Imperial Historiography. At the downfall of the Ming dynasty, in 1644, the original at Nanking and the duplicate copy in the Office of Historiography perished by fire. The copy deposited in the pavilion had been transferred to the Han-lin College, which, as has been stated, was established outside the Imperial City in 1442, and thus escaped destruction at the hands of the rebels; but even that was found later on to be wanting 2,422 sections, or over 1,000 volumes. We are nowhere told that this last was actually a facsimile of the original, but the scale and style in which it was produced leave little room for any other conclusion. Ku Chiang, a great scholar and a loyal adherent of the Mings, who after their fall changed his name to Ku Yen-wu, and resolutely declined to serve under the Manchus, has stated in his well-known *Adversaria* that the entire work was destroyed; but the editors of the *Imperial Catalogue*, drawn up between 1772–1782, declared him to be in error, and we now know that they were right. They add that the hand of God (literally) was manifestly guiding the original compilers in order that so many valuable books as are preserved in this encyclopædia, many of which have since been reprinted, should be handed down for the use of posterity.

This entry in the *Imperial Catalogue*, itself a wonderful work, running to 200 sections and bound up in twenty-six thick volumes octavo, soon attracted the notice of foreign students, many of whom doubted not only the present existence of the *Yung Lo Ta Tien*, but even that such a vast undertaking had ever been carried to completion. Stories were current, however, among Chinese literates which agreed as to the great size of the volumes while differing in matters of detail; and some of the Manchu *bitgeshi*, or clerks, employed at the British Legation were ready to swear that they had seen it with their own eyes. Meanwhile foreign scholars were in a state of suspended judgment, until in June 1900 the veil which had so long shrouded the *Yung Lo Ta Tien* in mystery was rudely drawn aside.

I will now quote from the diary of my son, Mr. Lancelot Giles, of H.B.M. China Consular Service, who went through the siege of Peking:

Saturday, the 23rd of June.—At 11.15 A.M. a fire was reported in the Han-lin, where the Chinese were entrenched. It was got under and the Han-lin cleared of Chinese troops.

There was some doubt as to whether we should occupy the Han-lin as a strategic position, and pull down the buildings in order to prevent fires. It was argued, however, that the Chinese would never set fire to so venerable a monument of the country's literature.

This was set at naught by the Chinese, who fired the various buildings all through the day. The library was almost entirely destroyed. An attempt was made to save the famous *Yung Lo Ta Tien*; but heaps of volumes had been burnt, so the attempt was given up. I secured volume 13,345 [he meant the volume containing that section] for myself, merely as a specimen. The pages are 1 foot 8 inches by 1 foot, and the volumes vary from $\frac{1}{2}$ inch to 1 inch in thickness. Each page has eight columns, and each column contains two rows of twenty-six characters.

I also picked up a couple of the essays written by some candidate for one of the great examinations.

Within the next few days we completed the work begun by the Chinese, and razed the Han-lin to the ground.

Since the siege of Peking five volumes of the *Yung Lo Ta Tien* have reached me, as follows:

(1) Sections 13,344, containing poetry, apparently the concluding portion of an anthology; and 13,345, dealing with the terminology of canonisation, as bestowed upon Emperors and deserving officials.

Canonisation is a matter of course for Emperors and certain members of the Imperial family; for officials it is the one honour which throws all others of a more transitory character into the shade. The Emperor who decided that history should begin with his reign, B.C. 221, abolished canonisation and substituted the ordinal numbers, starting from himself as the First. His line, however, ended with his son, who was called the Second. Canonisation was refused in the case of Admiral Ting, who for humanity's sake surrendered Wei-hai-wei to the Japanese, and then committed suicide. Had he committed suicide without surrendering, hundreds of his countrymen would have been killed and wounded, and his own name blazoned on the roll of China's immortals. Even now we read that the Empress Dowager is about to canonise the wise counsellors who advised her against the extermination-of-foreigners policy and who received decapitation as their reward.

(2) Sections 16,343 and 16,344, containing chapters fourteen and fifteen of a treatise on arithmetic.

Here is a specimen of the arithmetic: 'If silk is worth 240 cash a pound, and you have 1,328 cash, how much silk can you buy? Answer: 5 lbs. 8 ozs. $12\frac{1}{2}$ dwts.' (Curiously enough, although the decimal system prevails in China, the lb. is divided into sixteen ozs.

and the ounce into twenty-four dwts.) Similar, but much more difficult questions in interest, square measure, &c., are given farther on, in all cases with methods for working.

(3) Sections 19,742, containing some historical episodes classed under a certain character, *lu* = record; and 19,743, containing a vocabulary of characters of the same phonetic value as *lu* above mentioned.

(4) Sections 19,789 and 19,790, dealing with vestments, Court dresses, official robes, &c.

(5) Section 19,792, also dealing with vestments, &c.

At the end of each volume is a slip with the name of the officials and scholars whose duty it was to copy, punctuate, and compare with the original the text of that particular volume. From these slips we gather proofs of two important points: (1) that the present volumes are actually copies, and not the original work, and (2) that they date from 1562-67, as stated in the *Imperial Catalogue*. For two names are mentioned, representing the chief directors in regard to these five volumes, namely, Ch'én I-ch'in and Ch'in Ming-lei, which duly appear in the biographical records of the Ming dynasty. Ch'én I-ch'in was born in 1510, and graduated in the third or highest degree in 1541. He was then appointed to the Han-lin College, and rose to be one of its Chancellors, subsequently becoming President of the Board of Rites, and dying in 1586. Of Ch'in Ming-lei we are told only that he graduated in the third degree in 1544, that he was appointed to be Compiler in the Han-lin College, and rose to be President of the Board of Rites. *In each case the evidence is enough. It establishes the fact that during the period 1562-67, when the *Yung Lo Tu Tien* is said to have been copied out under the direction of Ch'én I-ch'in and Ch'in Ming-lei, two scholars such as would be required, bearing those names, and both members of the Han-lin College, were alive and available for the work.

The great literary monument which I have here attempted to describe is now gone for ever. We had been led to believe that it lay neglected in a shed, and had long since succumbed to decay by natural processes. Yet it must have been well cared for, and guarded from damp and insects, to judge by the wonderful state of preservation in which these five volumes appear to-day. It was, in fact, too well guarded. Ever since Peking was first opened in 1860, all applications from foreign scholars to be allowed even to view such an interesting relic have always been curtly refused. There is no occasion for any further display of such dog-in-the-manger sentimentality. China has lost her treasure through the unbridled violence of her own sons; while the only hands stretched forward to save it from destruction were those of the foreigners from whom it had been so jealously withheld.

HERBERT A. GUNN.

THE FIRST QUEEN OF PRUSSIA

SOPHIE CHARLOTTE, first Queen of Prussia, had English blood in her veins: she was the daughter of that remarkable woman, the Electress Sophia of Hanover, and a granddaughter of Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, Princess of Great Britain and Ireland, daughter of King James the First. These three princesses, grandmother, mother and daughter, formed a trinity of wonderful women. Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, for her beauty and misfortunes known as 'The Queen of Hearts,' was one of the most intellectual princesses of her time, and her reasoning powers and determination were almost masculine. Nor was her ambition one whit behind her abilities. It was she who urged her husband to take up the uneasy crown of Bohemia. 'If you cannot trust yourself to accept a crown,' she said to him when he hesitated, 'you should not have married a King's daughter.' So he wore it for a few brief months, but lost it again at the battle of the White Mountain, when his kingdom vanished like a dream of the night, and the 'Winter King,' as he was called, and his consort became fugitives in Europe. When the fortunes of the royal pair were at their lowest Sophia was born, the youngest of a large family. This princess, who was at one time put forward as a possible wife for her first-cousin, King Charles the Second of England, wedded later Ernest Augustus, Prince-Bishop of Osnabrück, and afterwards Elector of Hanover. She was the mother of King George the First of England; through her the Hanoverian dynasty came to sit upon the throne of England. Sophia was a great princess in every sense of the term, learned, gifted, and endowed with considerable governing ability. With her husband she raised Hanover from a petty dukedom to the rank of an electorate, and she nursed her English prospects with consummate skill. She had her mother's soaring ambition. 'I care not when I die,' she said, 'if on my tomb it be inscribed that I was Queen of England,' a desire which was not gratified, as she died two months before Queen Anne, and on her tomb at Hanover she is described as the 'Heiress of Great Britain.'

Sophie Charlotte was her only daughter, coming midway between three elder and three younger sons. Like her mother and grandmother, she inherited many traits from her Stuart ancestors.

Mary's wit and passion, James the First's love of metaphysical and theological disputations, were reproduced in her; and she possessed, too, in no small degree, the beauty, dignity, and personal charm characteristic of the race, which even the infusion of sluggish German blood could not mar. Her grandmother's romantic temperament was balanced by her mother's shrewd common-sense. Sophie Charlotte was carefully educated with a view to her making a great match some day; she was an accomplished musician and a good linguist, speaking French, English, and Italian as fluently as her native tongue, and French more so. She read much and widely in the literature of these languages, a very unusual thing among German princesses of that age. From her earliest youth her mother impressed upon her that she was to play a leading part upon the world's stage. Our first glimpse of her is when she was only five years old, taking part in a pastoral play at Osnabrück, and reciting the following lines, which Leibnitz afterwards recalled as prophetic:

Vous qui me courtisez sur la verte fougère,
 Peut-être ailleurs me ferez-vous la cour;
 A présent je suis bergère,
 Je puis être reine un jour.

The princess's early religious education was hardly on a level with her secular one, for the Electress Sophia, in accordance with her policy of making all things subservient to her daughter's future advancement, decided to bring her up with an open mind in matters of religion, so that she might be eligible to marry the most promising prince who presented himself, whether he were Catholic or Protestant. As a courtly biographer put it: 'She (Sophie Charlotte) refrained from any open confession of faith until her marriage, for reasons of prudence and of state, because only then would she be able to judge which religion would be best suited to her condition of life.' There was once an idea of marrying her to the Dauphin, eldest son of Louis the Fourteenth, and the French envoy sounded the Electress Sophia on the subject of her daughter's faith. She answered, 'She is of no religion as yet.' Despite this theological complaisance the match fell through, and so did another projected with the Elector Maximilian Emanuel of Bavaria, who was also a Catholic.

Sophie Charlotte's religion was finally settled on the Protestant side, for when the Electoral Prince of Brandenburg, son of the Great Elector, came forward as a suitor, Sophia eagerly accepted him for her daughter, despite the fact that he was a widower, twelve years older than Sophie Charlotte, deformed, and of anything but an amiable reputation. These drawbacks were as trifles compared to the fact that he was heir to the most powerful electorate of North Germany. The wedding took place with great pomp at Hanover in

September 1684, and the bride and bridegroom made their state entry into Berlin two months afterwards. A few years later Sophie Charlotte gave birth to a son, Frederick William, who was destined to become the second King of Prussia, and the father of Frederick the Great. Four years later the Great Elector died, and with her husband's accession she became the reigning Electress of Brandenburg.

The salient points of Sophie Charlotte's character now began to make themselves apparent. The Court of Berlin, modelled on that of Versailles, was a brilliant one, and every public function was carried out with elaborate ceremonial; for the Elector Frederick, like the Grand Monarque, held that a splendid and stately court was the outward and visible sign of a prince's power and greatness. Sophie Charlotte, on the contrary, disliked the pomp and pageantry inseparable from sovereignty, and, though she was careful to discharge the duties of her position, she did so in a spirit of magnificent indifference. The Elector had a positive passion for display, which he seized every opportunity of gratifying, and would spend hours debating over the minutiae of court etiquette. This was weariness of the soul to Sophie Charlotte. 'Leibnitz talked to me to-day of the infinitely little,' she wrote once to her friend and confidant, Fräulein von Pöllnitz. '*Mon Dieu!* as if I did not know enough about that!' The young Electress had arrived at a great position, but her heart was empty; she felt towards her husband nothing but a half-contemptuous toleration, which scarcely concealed a passive dislike. The Elector, on his part, was proud of his beautiful and talented young wife, though he was rather afraid of her. It would have been easy for Sophie Charlotte, had she been so minded, to have gained great influence over her consort, who was in every way her inferior, and to have ruled through him. But though her intellect was masculine in its calibre, unlike her mother, she had no love of domination, and cared not to meddle with affairs of state, or to concern herself with the intrigues of politics and of courts. These things were to her but vanity, and she preferred rather to live a life of intellectual contemplation and philosophic calm. The scientific discoveries of Newton were more to her than kingdoms, and the latest theory of Leibnitz greater than all the grandeur of the Court.

Sophie Charlotte's nature was essentially refined; she had a great love of art and of all things beautiful, and in this the Elector was able to sympathise, though he did not follow her in her literary and philosophic bent. He built for her a palace at Lützenburg, later called, after her, Charlottenburg, and brought to it every resource of nature and art. The gardens were laid out after the plan of Versailles by Le Nôtre, with terraces, statues, and fountains; the orangery was the finest in Europe, and the hothouses were filled with the rarest flowers. Magnificent pictures, beautiful carpets, rare furniture

of inlaid ebony and ivory, porcelain and crystal, were stored in this lordly pleasure-house, which spoke the last word in luxury and art.

At Lützenburg Sophie Charlotte lived a life apart, and was able to give full rein to her inclinations. At Lützenburg learning and wit, and not wealth and rank, gave the *entrée*. Here, surrounded by a special circle of her intimate friends, Sophie Charlotte gave her talents full play and enjoyed the free intercourse of ideas. At Lützenburg she held receptions on certain evenings in the week, and on these occasions all trammels of court etiquette were laid aside, and everything was conducted without ostentation. To these receptions came not only some of the most beautiful and witty ladies of the court, but also learned men from every country of Europe, professors, philosophers, theologians, both Catholic and Protestant, eminent representatives of literature, science, and art, besides a number of French refugees and others who did not appear at court in the ordinary way. Since the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes Berlin had become a centre for Huguenots, many of them of intellectual eminence and noble birth, who were now banished from their native land. They were made especially welcome at Lützenburg, where everything was French rather than German. At Sophie Charlotte's *réunions* French only was spoken, and so elegant were the appointments, so refined and courteous the manners, so perfect was the taste, and so brilliant the conversation, that one of the most celebrated of the Huguenot nobility declared that he felt himself once again in France, and asked whether the Electress could really speak German.

To Lützenburg came the eloquent Huguenot preacher and theologian, Beausobre, whom the Electress appointed a chaplain, and paid his salary out of her own purse. At other times came Vota, a celebrated Jesuit priest and Roman Catholic controversialist; Toland, the English free-thinker; Papendorf, the historian; Handel, the musician, when he was a mere boy; and last, and among the greatest, the famous Leibnitz, philosopher, mathematician, historian, and man of affairs, who found in Sophie Charlotte, as in her mother, a generous patroness and trusted friend. Hither came often, too, on many a visit, the Electress Sophia from Hanover, the 'merry *débonnaire* princess of Germany,' who, like her daughter, delighted in theological polemics and philosophical disquisitions. Liberal principles in religion and politics were the vogue at Lützenburg. Sophie Charlotte's early religious training, or rather her lack of it, was very noticeable in the trend of thought she gave to her *réunions*. She submitted everything to the tribunal of reason; she would take nothing for granted. Her eager, active spirit was always seeking to know the truth, even the 'why of the why,' as Leibnitz grumbled once. Her mother, the Electress Sophia, 'sat very loose in her religious opinions,' to quote Dean Lockier. She would seem to have

been a rationalist with a strong dash of Calvinism. Sophie Charlotte went a step further; she was nothing of a Calvinist, but leant rather to the theories of Descartes. 'My mother is a clever woman, but a bad Christian,' her son said once; and this was true if he meant a dogmatic Christian, though Leibnitz had a theory for reconciling Christianity with reason which especially commended itself to Sophie Charlotte. Whatever her religion, she took a keen interest in theological controversies, and when any clever Jesuit came her way she would delight in nothing so much as to make him expound his views, and then command one of her Protestant or Huguenot chaplains to endeavour to answer him. In this way she set the learned Jesuit Vota disputing with the Protestant Brensenius, and the orthodox Huguenot, Beausobre, with the free-thinking sceptic, Toland. Nor were these debates confined to theological questions only; scientific, philosophic, historic, and social questions, everything in short, came within the debatable ground. On one occasion we hear of a long and animated argument on the question as to whether marriage was ordained for the procreation of children! The Electress presided over all these intellectual tournaments, throwing in a suggestion here or raising a doubt there. She was always able to draw the best out of everyone, and, thanks to her tact and amiability, the disputes on these thorny questions were invariably conducted without unpleasantness.

Sophie Charlotte eagerly sought the society of the greatest men of the time, from Peter Bayle to Peter the Great, without reference to their rank, nationality, or position. She met Peter the Great in 1697, when he was journeying through North Germany on his way to Holland, travelling *incognito*, but with a numerous suite. The fame of the great Tsar, the paradoxes and eccentricities of his character, his marvellous abilities, his barbarism, and his love of splendour, had spread throughout Europe. The Elector of Brandenburg travelled with his court to Königsberg to meet the great potentate, but reasons of etiquette compelled him to leave his consort behind. Sophie Charlotte was much disappointed, and commissioned one of the Ministers to send her a full and particular account of the Tsar. 'I regret much that he and his suite are not coming to Berlin,' she writes, 'for, much as I dislike uncleanness, my curiosity on this occasion triumphs over my dislike.' The accounts which reached her from Königsberg only served to heighten her curiosity, which was at last gratified when she was on a visit at Hanover. She writes to the Minister, von Fuchs:

At last I can cry quits with you, for I have seen the great Tsar. After much difficulty he made an appointment to see me at Kappenbrüggen, but he did not bargain for the whole family coming too, and we had to argue with him for an hour before he would consent to appear at all. At last he agreed that the Duke of Celle, my mother, my brothers, and I should meet him at supper in the hall,

and he arranged that he would enter by a private door, so as to avoid being seen, for he had espied a crowd on entering the village. - My mother welcomed him with many greetings, but he was so shy at first that he hid his face with his hands and made Lefort answer for him, pretending that he could speak no French. After a while we managed to tame him a little, and he sat down to table between my mother and myself. We talked to him in turns, and sometimes both at once, so eager were we to hear what he had to say. Sometimes he spoke himself and sometimes through an interpreter; he always talked very much to the point on any and every subject which arose. My mother's cheery, lively disposition prompted her to ply him with innumerable questions, all of which he answered freely. I only wonder he was not tired of talking, for I believe conversation is not much in vogue in his own country. As to his grimacing, I thought it would be worse than it really was, though sometimes it was quite beyond his control. I noticed, too, that he did not know how to eat his food properly, though his manner was easy and free from restraint, and in a short time he made himself quite at home. He had at first been shy of meeting our ladies and gentlemen in attendance; presently he allowed them to come in, and after stationing his favourite servant, whom he calls his 'right arm,' at the door to prevent their going out again, he sent for big glasses and offered wine to all, handing the glass to each one himself as a mark of honour. I ordered my Italian musicians to sing to him, and he praised them, especially Ferdinando, whom he also rewarded with a glass of wine. To please him we remained four hours at table, and drank his health *à la Muscovite*, that is, all together and standing. As I wanted to see the Tsar dance, I begged him to send for his musicians, and they came in after supper, but he would not dance until he had first seen us do so, so we led off as he wished. He would not, and could not, dance until he had gloves, and though his suite sought for them high and low, none were forthcoming. The Muscovite dance was very pretty, and the Tsar was very much pleased with the evening.

The Electress Sophia also wrote an account of this meeting to her niece, the Duchesse d'Orléans:—

The Tsar is a very tall man, with a handsome face and a noble bearing. His manner is most vivacious, and he is quick at repartee, but, with his great natural gifts, it is a pity his tastes are not a little less barbarous. He was very cheerful and conversational, and we became great friends. My daughter and he exchanged snuffboxes; the Tsar's was embellished with his monogram, and my daughter treasures it. I asked him if he liked hunting; he said his father had liked it immensely, but for himself he had a passion for navigation and fireworks. He said he worked at shipbuilding himself, and showed us his hands with pride, and made us feel the blisters formed on them by hard labour. After supper was over the Tsar sent for his fiddlers, and we danced some Russian dances, which I liked much better than the polonaise. It was daylight before we broke up. The Tsar is quite an extraordinary man; it is impossible to form an opinion of him until one has seen him, and then it is impossible to describe him. He has a kind heart, and gave utterance to many lofty sentiments. I must also tell you that he did not become the least intoxicated in our presence, but no sooner had we gone than his suite fully made up for lost time. He is most sensible to the charms of female beauty, but, to be just, I saw no attempts at gallantry. In his country it is the custom of women to paint themselves red and white, which is no doubt the reason why the Muscovites admire Countess Platen so much. In dancing they thought the bones of our stays were our own bones, and the Tsar said: 'The German ladies have infernally hard bones.'

Leibnitz wrote about this time: 'As the Electress of Brandenburg is now entirely in her husband's confidence, we must weigh this state of

affairs well, try to make it permanent, and draw from it any advantage that may reasonably be expected.' This was written of something to the advantage of the House of Hanover, but it held equally good in matters nearer home. It was Sophie Charlotte who instilled into the Elector's mind the idea of establishing an Academy of Science in Berlin. She cleverly reminded him of what Louis the Fourteenth had done in this direction as a patron of the arts, and it flashed upon the Elector at once that such an institution would increase the brilliance of his reign and hand him down to posterity as a learned prince who patronised science. Leibnitz was called into consultation, again at the Electress's suggestion, and the outcome of it was that the Academy of Science was duly founded, with Leibnitz as its first president. Frederick the Great declares in his memoirs that this scientific institution owed its foundation to his grandmother, Sophie Charlotte, 'a princess,' he says, 'who possessed the genius of a great man and the knowledge of a learned one.'

In return for the Elector's complaisance in this matter Sophie Charlotte gave a masquerade in honour of his birthday at Lützenburg. The description of it, which Leibnitz wrote in a letter to the Electress Sophia, is worth quoting, as it offers a curious picture of the manners and amusements of the Court of Berlin at this time :

The scene [he says] represented a village fair, and at the different booths, under quaint signs, the Margrave Christian Louis, M. Dobdan, M. de Hamel, and others sold hams, sausages, tongues, beef, wine, lemonade, tea, coffee, chocolate, and such-like things for a mere song. M. Dosten figured as a quack doctor, and had his harlequins, buffoons, and tumblers, among whom was the Margrave Albert, but the cleverest and prettiest sight of all was his juggler, which was played by the Electoral Prince, who had effectively learned conjuring for the occasion. The Electress appeared as the doctor's wife, and presided over the sale of quack medicines. M. Désaleurs played the part of a dentist very well indeed. The masquerade was formally opened by the entry of the doctor mounted on an imitation elephant, while the doctor's wife was borne in on her chair by her Turks; the juggler, tumblers, harlequins, and buffoons followed. As soon as the procession had passed there was a Bohemian ballet, danced by the ladies of the court under the leadership of the Princess of Hohenzollern. An astrologer also appeared with his glasses and telescope. I was to have taken this part, but I got Count Witgenstein to relieve me of it. The astrologer foretold much good fortune to the Elector, who was looking down on the scene from his box hard by, and the Princess of Hohenzollern, the leading gipsy, told the fortune of the Electress in a charming manner. Then her lady-in-waiting had the toothache, and the dentist, brandishing his tweezers, pretended to pull at her mouth, and presently drew forth a tooth as long as your arm; it was a walrus tusk. The scene was a veritable tower of Babel, everyone speaking his own tongue; and, in courtly allusion to the Electress figuring as the doctor's wife, someone sang a song about Doctor Cupid and his love philtres. At last the Elector himself came down from his box disguised as a Dutch sailor, and bought many things at the fair. There was a magnificent orchestra playing the whole time, and all present agreed that a grand opera, costing thousands of crowns, would not have been nearly so enjoyable.

The Electress Sophia sent Leibnitz's letter to the Duchesse

d'Orléans to show her that they could do these things quite as well in Germany as in France. But neither Leibnitz nor his patroness, Sophie Charlotte, cared for such frivolities, for we find him writing to a friend a few days later: 'I lead a life here at Berlin which the Electress calls with me "a paltry life," *ein liederliches Leben*. I am all upset and quite out of my element.'

Leibnitz was at liberty to return to his 'element' when he willed, but the Electress, with all her intellectual detachment, could not keep wholly free from affairs of state. The exigencies of her position forced her occasionally to take a hand in politics, whether she would or no. By an irony of fate, she, whose contempt for titles and honours was so great that she was called the 'Republican Queen,' was destined to be largely instrumental in increasing the titular dignity of her house. To gratify her mother she had successfully persuaded her husband to use all his influence with the Emperor to raise her father's dukedom of Hanover to an electorate, and now, at the bidding of her husband, she was to undertake a delicate mission to win over the Elector of Bavaria and the King of England to recognise the Elector of Brandenburg's assumption of the regal power. To take upon himself the title of king had long been the ambition of the Elector of Brandenburg, as it was of his father before him. Two events had recently combined to hasten his determination in this matter. One was that his brother Elector of Saxony had become King of Poland; the other was that at a conference at the Hague his ally, the King of England, had refused to grant him the dignity of an armchair, the prerogative of kingly rank, and as the Elector refused the *tabouret* a quarrel had only been avoided by both illustrious personages standing throughout the interview. After prolonged negotiations and a good deal of money the Emperor's approval had been obtained, and that of other important princes, but the consent of two was still lacking: of William the Third, King of England, who was also hereditary Stadtholder in Holland, and the Elector of Bavaria, who, as the Elector Stadtholder in Brussels, represented the Catholic Netherlands. It was resolved that, under the plea of ill-health, Sophie Charlotte should make a journey to Aix-la-Chapelle, and thence go to visit these potentates at the Hague and Brussels respectively. A large sum was granted to the Electress for the expenses of her journey, which was undertaken with a numerous suite, and it was further arranged that her mother, the Electress Sophia, whose diplomatic talents were renowned, should accompany her. After a course of the waters at Aix, the two Electresses went to Brussels, where the Elector of Bavaria received them with every possible honour, and paid great homage to Sophie Charlotte, who fascinated him with her wit and beauty. Before leaving she obtained his promise that he would recognise the kingship if the King of England would do the same. The only drawback to her

visit was that the Electress of Bavaria, who was jealous, refused to appear in public with her, and feigned illness as an excuse. Sophie Charlotte, however, having gained what she wanted, treated this matter lightly, and joked with the Elector about it, rallying him with his having formerly paid his court to her. 'Without flattering myself,' she said, 'I think I may safely say that I should have made you a more suitable consort than your present one. You love gaiety, and I am not averse to it; you are gallant, and I am not jealous; you would never find me in a bad humour; there is no doubt we should have made a very happy couple.'

From Brussels the two Electresses repaired to Holland, where, at the palace of Loo, they paid an equally satisfactory visit to King William. Sophie Charlotte obtained his consent to her husband assuming the title of king, and the Electress Sophia received from him a formal promise that the succession of the English throne should be assured to herself and her heirs, being Protestant, in the event of himself and Anne dying without issue.

Sophie Charlotte returned in triumph to Berlin, where the Elector was anxiously awaiting her. The Emperor's consent now followed as a matter of course, and all obstacles being removed, the Elector of Brandenburg resolved to transform himself into a king without delay. As the dukedom of Prussia did not belong to the German Empire, the Elector thought it would be the most-suitable territory to raise to a kingdom, and Königsberg, where he was born, the most fitting place for the scene of his coronation, which, according to his tastes, he resolved to celebrate with every possible magnificence. Before the Electress had properly rested from her journey, she had to set off again with her husband on a state pilgrimage to Königsberg. Some idea of the gorgeous scale on which it was arranged may be gathered from the fact that thirty thousand horses were needed in the procession. The Electress looked forward with dismay to this endless vista of wearisome ceremonies, and declared to her ladies that the thought of having to play the part of 'a theatre queen to her husband's *Æsop*' filled her with consternation. She wrote to Leibnitz at this time: 'Do not believe that I prefer the crowns and splendours which they think so highly of here to the delight of those philosophical conversations we used to have at Lützenburg.'

Frederick the First crowned himself King of Prussia with great pomp and circumstance at Königsberg on the 18th of January, 1701, and at the same time crowned his Queen. The court chroniclers of the time exhausted themselves in descriptions of the magnificent ceremony, the length of the banquetings, the splendour of the jewels and robes, the beauty of the Queen, the wisdom of the King, and the enthusiasm of the people. Their Majesties, seated on a silver throne, received the homage of their subjects. Varnhagen writes:

The Queen was vested in cloth of gold, embroidered with poppies, and every seam sewn with diamonds; the whole of the front of her bodice was covered with diamonds. On her right breast she wore a 'bunch' of pear-shaped pearls of enormous size and inestimable value; her cloak of purple velvet and ermine, embroidered with golden eagles, was like unto the King's, and her crown of pure gold, closely studded with diamonds, shone all the better by contrast with the curls of her jet-black hair; her eyes were bluer than the turquoises, and indeed the gifts conferred on her by nature far surpassed the jewels of her attire, and the onlookers, enraptured by so much beauty, not only wished the Queen joy of her crown, but still more wished the crown luck for having such a Queen.

The King revelled in all this splendour and ceremonial, the Queen was bored to death with it. She seems, however, to have acquitted herself to his satisfaction except on one occasion, which, unfortunately, was during the coronation ceremony. She was sitting under a golden canopy opposite the King, and wearied of the long panegyric of the preacher, and half fainting with fatigue, she impatiently pulled out her snuffbox (the one given her by Peter the Great) and refreshed herself with a pinch. 'Unfortunately,' writes a pompous chronicler, 'the King observed this action of her Majesty,' of which the ceremony did not admit, and not only did he show her by his frowns his ill opinion of her conduct, but he sent a chamberlain to request her to remember the place wherein she was, and not to forget the position she occupied.' Poor Sophie Charlotte! There was a great deal of human nature in that pinch of snuff.

The Queen of Prussia, as she is henceforth to be called, made few friends of her own sex; most of them were 'too paltry,' to use her own words, which meant that they were too petty and narrow to please her liberal mind. Like her mother, her friendships were chiefly with men, but there were two notable exceptions to this rule. One was the beautiful Princess Caroline of Ansbach, who eventually became Queen Consort of George the Second, King of England, and who had the greatest admiration for, and devotion to, her. The other was Fräulein von Pöllnitz, her chief lady-in-waiting. Her friendship for this lady is revealed in the following letter, preserved in the Prussian State Archives, which furnishes an admirable example of the Queen's epistolary style:—

Your letter, my dear Pöllnitz, has taken me unawares, and I cannot answer such sweetness as I would, but I would rather a thousand times you should doubt my intelligence than my friendship. Alas! what am I when you are away; I cannot even laugh at the *bagatelles* of those around me, for with whom can I laugh? La Bülow [another lady-in-waiting] has good sound common sense, but her wit is shod in hobnailed boots; those fine points you grasp so quickly she misses utterly; the others are mere idiots. You, my dear friend, are the very soul of my life; all the rest weary me. The Abbé says he can spur on Pegasus, but he is a dullard. Talking of dullards, she who is supposed to have the honour of entertaining F—— [the King] came here yesterday decked out like an altar, but it was an infernal altar, consecrated to the evil one. Philosophers say that nature abhors a vacuum, but I, beloved, loathe a surfeit. Yesterday two ladies came to my court, B—— and W——, fat to their teeth, sulky to their topknots, and stupid to their heels.

Is it possible to believe that God, in creating such types, created them after His own image? No! He made a special mould of quite another kind to teach us by comparison the value of beauty and grace. If you think me profane—well, I know to whom I am writing; ‘birds of a feather flock together’—I am in a wicked mood to-day and must go on. I have also given audience to two boobies of foreigners. If gold braid and fine clothes meant greatness, nothing could exceed theirs, but as outward show does not appeal to me I quickly took their measure. I know that the sight of kings and queens sometimes makes people nervous and apparently stupid. When that is the case I try to encourage them, but when toadyism is obvious, and presumption and stupidity try to usurp the place due to real merit, I am pitiless and spare them not. How estimable a quality is real modesty, and how rare! Do not we always think we are a few degrees better than our neighbours? How vile a thing is self-conceit, and yet we are fated to have it always by us. Great Leibnitz, what beautiful things you would have to say on this subject! You plead, you persuade, but you do not chide. I am in a moralising mood. But the curtain is up and a new singer is about to sing; his reputation has preceded him. If he comes up to it, how I shall enjoy myself! Adieu, adieu. What, you still detain me when music is luring me away? I sacrifice my friend to the arts. Adieu, I say once more.

There are other letters of the Queen’s—letters that a Sévigné might have written, letters on divers questions—but those to Fräulein von Pöllnitz are the most intimate, and give the best glimpses of the writer’s character. They express, without reserve, the Queen’s weariness of the life she was compelled to live, her impatience of her husband’s lack of understanding and sympathy, a craving to know everything that philosophy and science could teach her, and even more. As written from a Queen to her subject, they are paralleled only by the ‘Friendship letters’ of Frederick the Great. In one of them we find a complaint against Leibnitz. ‘Much as I like this man, I feel inclined to be angry with him. He treats everything in so superficial a way when writing to me; it must be that he distrusts my intellect, for he seldom answers with precision any points that I may raise.’ More frequently her letters contain allusions to a very real trouble, the bad qualities which were beginning to make themselves manifest in her son, the Crown Prince, afterwards King Frederick William the First of Prussia. In one of these she writes:—

I am in sore trouble, my dear Pöllnitz, and would fain relieve my heart by opening it to you, for besides those worries you know of I have another which your devotion to me foretold long ago. My son, who I thought was only quick and impulsive, has shown signs of a grasping hardness, which can only originate from a wicked heart. ‘Oh no,’ says La Bülow, ‘it is merely avarice.’ *Mon Dieu, mon Dieu*, so much the worse. Avaricious at his tender age! Other faults may be corrected, but avarice grows with years, and what evil effects it will have later! How can kindness or pity find room in a heart where self-interest reigns supreme? Dohna [the Prince’s Governor] is an honest, upright man, of high principle, but his failing, alas! is also penuriousness, and he cannot well correct a fault which in his heart he approves. I sent for my son and lectured him well, and as that does not happen often, on this occasion I recalled and dwelt upon his many vicious and evil doings, for I have, alas! to add that repeated complaints have come to me from my ladies that he has taken liberties with them and spoken improperly. My grief at

this thought turned to anger. 'Is such conduct evidence of refinement?' I asked. 'Is there any greatness in insults? How coarse a mind is yours, to insult and suggest improprieties to a sex which should be the recipients of chivalrous politeness from men!' The Abbé came in while I was scolding. 'How great is this!' quoth he; 'I seem to see Agrippina lecturing Nero.' Indignant at the comparison, and dreading the augury, I answered him coldly. He departed crestfallen, and later I received these verses, with which he sought to make his peace. All this has upset me much. I fear I am going to be ill; I have symptoms of fever and a touch of bile. Come back soon, dear heart, to share my sorrows and my joys.

The fear of approaching ill-health expressed in this letter became a reality all too soon. Though naturally of a strong constitution, the fatigue of endless ceremonial, the worries inseparable from her position, added to domestic troubles, told upon the Queen's health. It was resolved to send the Crown Prince on a lengthy tour of foreign travel, including England, in the hope that a greater knowledge of the world would improve his manners and morals. The Queen felt the parting keenly, for she truly loved her son, and though very transcendental about other matters she was keenly practical in anything which concerned his interest. But she grieved in silence, and after he was gone there was found a sheet of note-paper on her writing-table at Lützenburg, on which she had drawn a heart, and underneath had written the date and the words, '*Il est parti.*'

It is probable that this parting preyed upon her health and made her the more anxious to pay a visit to her mother at Hanover. In January 1704, notwithstanding the opposition of the King and the severity of the weather, Sophie Charlotte undertook the long and trying journey to Hanover. It was her last pilgrimage. She was ill before she set out, but she concealed her sickness lest the King should forbid her departure. At Magdeburg she broke down and had to take to her bed; in a few days she rallied and again took the road. After she had reached Hanover she seems to have conquered her illness, a tumour in the throat, by sheer force of will. In a few days, however, dangerous symptoms developed, and she became rapidly worse. Doctors were called in, but soon recognised that there was no hope left.

When the news was broken to the Queen, with the greatest composure and without any fear of death she resigned herself to the inevitable. Her death-bed belongs to history. A great deal of conflicting testimony has gathered around her last hours, but probably the account given by Frederick the Great, who had exceptional opportunities of knowing the truth, is the correct one. According to him, the French chaplain at Hanover, de la Bergérie, came to offer his ministrations, but the Queen said to him: 'Let me die without quarrelling with you. For twenty years I have devoted earnest study to religious questions; you can tell me nothing that I do not know already, and I die in peace.' To her faithful von Pöllnitz she exclaimed: 'What a useless fuss and ceremony they

make over this poor body !' And when she saw her women in tears, she said : ' Why do you weep ? Did you think I was immortal ? ' And again : ' Do not pity me. I am at last going to satisfy my curiosity about the origin of things, which even Leibnitz could never explain to me, to understand space, infinity, being, and nothingness. And as for the King, my husband—well, I shall afford him the opportunity of giving me a magnificent funeral and displaying all the pomp he loves so much.' Her aged mother, broken with grief, was ill in an adjoining room and could not come to her ; but to her brothers, George Louis, afterwards George the First, King of England, and Ernest Augustus, she bade an affectionate farewell. The pastor reminded her tritely that kings and queens were mortal equally with other men. She answered : '*Je le sais bien,*' and with a sigh expired.

Sophie Charlotte was in her thirty-seventh year when she died, and at her death a great light went out. She would have been a remarkable woman under any circumstances ; she was doubly remarkable when we remember her time and her environment. She was greatly mourned, and the chroniclers exhausted themselves in laborious panegyrics. They may be all summed up in the words of her grandson, Frederick the Great, who inherited a double portion of her spirit : ' She had a great soul.'

W. H. WILKINS.

AN 'ADVANCED' VIEW OF THE 'CHURCH CRISIS'

IT may be said with some reason that an article on the 'Church Crisis' comes a full year too late, since the 'crisis' ended, for the man in the street at least, when the Transvaal war began—'this most providential war,' as a venerable North London incumbent solemnly called it some fifteen months ago. Without making this opinion one's own, it may be admitted that the artificial excitement anent 'incense and portable lights' died away so soon as a true object of interest was provided to fill the public mind—and the newspapers. In one shape or another, however, there is always something like a 'crisis' in the Anglican Establishment; the exact situation shifts, like a kaleidoscope's pattern, from moment to moment, but the background of strain remains. Also, the Church Association is still alive, and so (in a sense) is Sir William Harcourt. The fire of straw has burned very low, but a little explosive fuel may make it burn up again.

If it be true, as many on either side seem to think it is, that Mr. Walsh's book did much towards lighting up the blaze of Protestant feeling, almost anything may happen. We are bound to believe that the author of *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement* takes his own work seriously, but it is hard to understand how any one else can do so. It is sad—let us even say it is dreadful—that little girls should be made to sit still when wasps are buzzing around them (though, by the way, that is the safest way of dealing with such wasps); likewise those 'Brotherhoods' made up of Simon Tappertit and two of his friends converted from 'No Popery,' and playing at being monks, are fearsome things. But that John Bull, at the end of the nineteenth century, should take such a 'thing of shreds and patches' gravely is more sad and more fearsome. To accept Mr. Walsh's bundle of gossip, innuendo, and garbled quotations as something serious, is like rating Miss Corelli's works as literature.

When *The Secret History* was published, copies were at first to be found more often perhaps in 'advanced' clergy-houses than anywhere else. In such presbyteries the book was welcomed as an

unfailing storehouse of jokes and source of harmless mirth; no one guessed that such a production would be looked on as anything more than a rather laboured jest. Yet there is no doubt that some impression was made on the popular mind by this queer medley. A cabman who drove me to the E.C.U. offices said, with much gravity, when given 'English Church Union' as an address: 'Beg pardon, sir, but is it true what they say, as how that society wants to give all Protestants over to the Pope, that he may burn them at Smithfield?' Not being a member of the E.C.U. myself, I had no scruple in giving away that useful association; so I replied, with equal gravity: 'Well, if you wish for a straightforward answer, I don't mind owning that such is their object; and I am now going to a special committee to settle what kind of faggots it will be best to use.' He seemed more pained at my admission than pleased with my candour—and the faggots were quite as real as Mr. Walsh's 'conspiracy.' But the worthy cabman gave one food for thought, none the less. In spite of a Board-school education, he honestly feared that the Papacy and the Inquisition of the sixteenth century might, in the twentieth, be brought back and hold sway in free and democratic England. At any rate, there was 'a secret conspiracy' to bring about such a state of things.

Now, in spite of much curious and interesting 'secret' history, drawn mostly from such hidden and mysterious sources as Parliamentary Blue-books, the public reports of societies, and advertisements in parish magazines, Mr. Walsh's book fails to bring to light any Popish plot. But the impression left on the minds of many of its readers is that, somehow and somewhere, a *conspiracy*, dark, dreadful, and dangerous, there must be. Yet there is no such conspiracy, there never has been one, and, alas! there never will be; for one good reason among many others, namely, that the 'Ritualist' clergyman is simply hopeless and impossible as a conspirator. 'The Ritualists are a mere mob,' said Dr. F. G. Lee once. Now, whatever else a mob may do, it cannot conspire. Dr. Lee's opinion, perhaps, overstates a truth; but true it certainly is that the 'Catholicising' party—if party it can be called—among the English clergy is about as undisciplined as a party can be. Any priest who tries to bring about united action at once finds himself confronted by opposing 'brethren,' who cavil with him to the ninth part of a hair; who fight fiercely against a motion which they agree with except as to one word, but feel bound because of that one word to oppose to the uttermost. Nay, even the use, by sheer chance, of a noun in the singular which should have been in the plural, may give the most dire offence. A weighty declaration by the E.C.U., at a critical moment, came nigh to rejection because by ill-hap an 's' dropped out from the end of a word! If some special example be sought of

the lack of united action amongst these conspirators, no better (or worse) one can be found than that of the clergy of a famous and 'advanced' London church a short time since as to the use of incense. Well knowing that what they did would be reported in half the newspapers in England, they made such changes in the wonted order of their Sunday and festival services as would render the use of incense at least not obligatory (according to Catholic custom); with the outcome that it was at once proclaimed that St. —'s had 'obeyed the archbishop's judgment, and given up incense.' Such was not the case; the incumbent did *not* think that Dr. Temple's 'opinion' claimed obedience, and the changes, which any parish priest would be within his rights in making, were not meant to be permanent, nor (as the event shows) was the use of incense—its ceremonial use—meant to be given up. But these latter facts were, for some weeks at least, locked in the bosoms of the clergy concerned; while all the ecclesiastical world saw or heard that after an admonition from the diocesan the censer had vanished from St. —'s. The effect on the action of the bishops of this seeming submission, and on the resistance of isolated parsons of this apparent surrender, must have been obvious. 'As to incense, St. —'s has spoken, *causa finita est*,' wrote one of the latter. Yet these effects were the very last which the good vicar of that London church wished to bring about. But at his church they 'had always taken a very individual line' (as when a former much-revered incumbent submitted to suspension at the hands of the Judicial Committee), and so, without recking of consequences to the faithful outside their own walls, they took it once again. Also, as there are no effective conspirators, so there is no centre, secret or otherwise, for the conspiracy. Societies, such as S.S.C., there are of course, where proceedings are private, just as those of the Railway Clearing House 'conferences' are private, and for much the same reason. But as I hope to be allowed to show at another time, such societies are neither meant to be, nor capable of being, made the headquarters of a band of plotters.

But—it may very well be said by an objector—be that as it may, conspiracy or no conspiracy, each and every authority in Church or State has over and over again given a verdict against you. You, indeed, are quite sure, honestly and in good faith, that you are right; but all other Christians, Protestant or Catholic, have no doubt that you are wrong. Some of the tribunals before which you have pleaded, or in which judgment has gone by default, may have been biassed; but that can hardly hold good of the many diocesan chancellors, Deans of Arches, bishops, and archbishops, who have agreed with the State courts in giving sentence against you. The one exception, when Archbishop Benson in a doubtful court, against the weight of

evidence, gave a judgment of policy as to 'lights,' &c., does little more than 'prove' the 'contrary' rule; for at most he only decided that if you did certain things in a kind of sidelong way they would be 'not unlawful.' Surely when one finds a true Dean of Arches agreeing with Lord Penzance, when the *Daily News* quotes with approval the words of Archbishop Temple, when Mr. Kensit is at one with Cardinal Vaughan, it is a case where *securus judicat* fairly applies. The round world knows best, and any reasonable men in your stead would own that they had been mistaken, and would either yield to lawful authority or 'go out.'

Yes, such an attack would be unanswerable, crushing indeed, were it not that a complete historical answer to it lies ready to hand. Such answer, put shortly, is this: Every change in the manner of Divine Service which the Tractarians began, almost every ceremonial practice which the 'Puseyites' tried to introduce, has long since been accepted, either as the ordinary 'use' in the Church (and so having no party character), or at least as something which no authority can forbid.

Choral morning and evening prayer (or even the chanting of the psalms), turning towards the altar at the Creed, gathering the alms in bags—as at Margaret Street Chapel—and, above all, preaching in a surplice: these were the things which the bishops and archbishops of those days joined in denouncing as unlawful, disloyal, or, even if some of them were technically legal, as wholly alien to the spirit of 'Our Reformed Church.' So, too, with legal decisions; the illegal 'stole' in all colours is worn without let or hindrance, and its use encouraged by many bishops, even in cases where there is no lawful ground according to Catholic practice or Anglican tradition for its being worn at all. The often-condemned crucifix, forbidden by diocesan chancellors again and again as well as by the civil courts, stands conspicuous above the high altars of great cathedrals, with episcopal and archiepiscopal sanction. But it is needless to multiply instances; they crowd on one even as one writes—the unbleached wax candles, the crosier and mitre, at the obsequies of the late Bishop of London; the picture of the Madonna and other trappings of the *chapelle ardente* where lay the body of our beloved Queen.

Truly, 'the flowing tide is with us,' but for the most part it moves smoothly, so that the progress does not startle; it is only now and then, when a rapid is reached or some cross-current roughens the water, that public attention is aroused. How far that tide has taken us let Lady Wimborne herself show, when she quotes once more that oft-quoted 'Plan of Campaign' article:

A choral service, so far as psalms and canticles are concerned, on some week-day evening . . . where there is monthly Communion, let it be fortnightly (*sic*); where it is fortnightly, let it be weekly; where all this is existing, candlesticks with unlighted candles (!) may be introduced. Where the black gown is in use in the pulpit on Sundays, let it disappear in the week.

It is wonderful that, when writing her sober and well-reasoned article in the October issue, Lady Wimborne did not see how strongly this passage told against her alarmist view. In 1867, 'the organ of the Ritualist party'—so she styles it, and so perhaps in its ante-Littledalean days it may have been—deemed half-choral services (on weekdays only), the surplice in the pulpit, with the same limitation, and unlighted candles things which needed a 'plain and frank statement to the people' before they were brought into use. Above all, the *Church Times* looked on a weekly celebration of the Eucharist as a counsel of perfection, even a fortnightly one being an innovation.

To-day it would be hard to find a town church, even of the most 'Evangelical' kind, where the Lord's Supper is not administered at some hour or another every Lord's Day; while as to the other things, they have long ago passed out of the region of party feeling, and are now only a part of the 'dignified accompaniments which generally attend morning prayer,' as Dr. Creighton put it in his latest charge. One may take it that Lady Wimborne herself sometimes worships without scruples of conscience in churches where the service is partly choral, where there is a weekly Communion, possibly even where that truly 'dark ceremony' of lightless candlesticks is in use; as for an unsurpliced preacher, she would be puzzled to find one unless she sought him in some very 'advanced' church where a funeral 'panegyric' was being delivered.

It is hard now even to believe, much less to realise, that such things raised fierce riots fifty years ago, and were still matters of furious controversy in the 'seventies.' Yet so it was; more than that, the very strongest censures on such practices were pronounced by bishops and archbishops. Just as nowadays there are one or two prelates who have refused to license assistant curates unless they undertook not to hear confessions, or promised to conform to the Lambeth 'Opinions,'¹ so then there were bishops who as arbitrarily and lawlessly required a pledge not to wear a surplice in the pulpit as a condition for licence, or even for ordination. Our 'High Church' friends—I hope I do no wrong to certain professors, canons, antiquarians, and others in even speaking of them as 'friends'—are never weary of telling us that in failing to obey our bishops we are not only lawless oath-breakers, but, above all, *un-Catholic*. But, we feel bound to ask, why if it be a wrong to 'disobey' Drs. Creighton, Perowne, or Forrest-Browne, was it right to withstand Drs. Blomfield, Baring, or Jackson? If the solemnly pronounced opinions of the present two primates 'must command universal obedience,' why should not the more unhesitating pronouncements of Archbishops Tait and Thompson require a like obedience?

¹ The latter was, if I mistake not, made a requisite for acceptance in a candidate for the priesthood—perhaps the worst instance of episcopal tyranny known to this generation.

Had such submission been yielded, it is certain that, so far as man's agency is concerned, the outward beauty of holiness would never have been restored to our churches, nor something of the light and warmth of Catholic devotion to our public worship. So far as we can judge from Tractarian experience, neither would the re-conversion of England to the One Faith have made much progress; great men as were the first leaders of the 'Oxford Movement,' they wrought surprisingly little change in the beliefs and religious practice of the laity of their day. Certainly High Churchmen would not have taken the lead, nor have won for themselves those fruits of other men's labours into which they now enter peacefully and in the light of episcopal favour. Before the 'Puseyite' revival of ceremonial, even so strong and bold a man as Dr. Hook, when vicar of a Coventry church with the (then) usual reading-desk out in the nave, declared that 'we *ought* to get back into the chancels, but that is impossible.' It may, indeed, be said that hitherto the bishops had only tried to enforce the bidding of secular courts, and did not speak—as our present primates have spoken—on their own responsibility. But this plea will not hold good. Dr. Tait (when Bishop of London) said expressly, as to one of the most important judgments, that his advice and Archbishop Sumner's was given, and, he believed, 'was perfectly followed.' Not only so, but the Lambeth Pastoral of 1875, put forth by the primates in the name of the assembled prelates of the Anglican rite throughout the world, speaks of these judgments as 'the law of this Church and realm thus clearly interpreted . . . (those) judicial decisions which we, the clergy, are *bound* by every *consideration* to obey.'²

The tolerant and fair-minded Bishop of Carlisle, Harvey Goodwin, had actually formed the same opinion as the Judicial Committee as to the 'advertisements' in Elizabeth's reign making void the present Ornaments Rubric, before that body put forth its most strange judgment—an opinion which now by common consent is owned to be an impossible one. Every pronouncement of the civil courts (except the first one which for the time legalised vestments) has been vouched for by former diocesans, not only as being authoritative in itself, but also as declaring the bishop's own mind. Yet some of these decisions have been practically reversed;—e.g. those against the 'eastward position' and altar-lights; others are openly disregarded, and some forbid things (such as the wearing of a stole) which many of our present bishops strongly approve. When once again we are called on to submit ourselves with glad minds to some new admonitions, we cannot forget what has gone before, nor doubt that such submission would leave us as far as ever from a final settlement.

None of us doubt that disobedience to bishops is in itself a grave

² Italics are my own.

evil, in fact an evil to be avoided at any cost except that of making ourselves partakers in the lawlessness of our chief pastors, their weak yielding to an unlawful State tyranny, or their contemptuous breaches of the common law and custom of the whole Church of Christ. In matters where no higher law is broken thereby, such obedience is and invariably has been yielded by the 'extreme' clergy, even when—as in the case of withholding or withdrawing curates' licences—the bishops' action has often been most capricious and unfair. So too, in liturgical points, the general obedience of the clergy as to 'additional services,' &c., has been acknowledged by almost every diocesan. In February of 1899 the Bishop of Winchester said: 'It is with genuine thankfulness I am able to say that . . . every formal direction which I have hitherto thought it needful to give has been complied with by the clergy concerned.'

In this spirit a hearing by the two primates of arguments on disputed points of ceremonial and ritual practices, with a pronouncement from them on such points, was wished for by some of the 'advanced' party, and would have been received with at least deep respect by all; provided only that it did not base itself upon the decisions of civil courts, nor read a 'not' into some of the Church's rubrics.

That authority is to be found in the Prayer-book for such archiepiscopal rulings we none of us believed. In one of the three introductory prefaces to the present Book, under the heading 'Concerning the Service of the Church,' there is a remark of the most casual kind that 'forasmuch as doubts may arise, to appease all such diversity (if any arise) . . . the parties that so doubt shall always resort to the bishop of the diocese. And if he be in doubt, then he may' ('may,' be it noted, not 'shall') 'send for the resolution thereof to the archbishop.' The context of the whole preface shows that it is only 'Divine Service'³—*i.e.* the 'choir offices, and not sacramental rites—with which it is concerned, and also that slight ambiguities on liturgical points, such as the 'concurrence' of feasts, the number of collects to be said, and so forth, are to be the matters thus dealt with. Even in such things the primate was not given jurisdiction, unless one of his suffragans were in doubt, and chose to send the matter to him 'for resolution.' Surely never before was a claim to so great authority based on such slight foundation. Also, in the case of the incumbents whose practices came before the two archbishops, no 'doubts' had 'arisen' in their minds: they did not 'so doubt,' hence they did not wish to 'resort to the bishop of the diocese'—in fact, they only consented to do so under strong pressure from their respective ordinaries.

³ In the English Breviaries the words 'Servitium Divinum' (Divine Service) were used for what is now usually called 'Officium Divinum'; they were never applied to the Mass.

Still, there was an earnest wish among the majority of the Catholicising party, lay and clerical, to hear and obey the voice of our chief pastors, even when they spoke without official authority. Lord Halifax and other laymen urged this course, backed up (as I can bear witness) by many 'extreme' priests. It is not our fault that in answer came that staggering pronouncement which flung us back to something little short of anarchy: a pronouncement resting wholly on a very doubtful interpretation of five words in a probably obsolete Act of Parliament. Our present rubric, written a hundred years after Elizabeth's Act, makes no reference whatever to that statute; yet Dr. Temple bids us believe that the whole sense of the rubric is governed by those five words of that Act, even to the extent of reversing its obvious meaning in many important points.

The Lambeth Opinion, in fact, made the following assumptions: (1) That the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity was 'adopted' by Convocation in 1662, seemingly as an Urban Council 'adopts' the Free Library Act; (2) that the words, 'None other or otherwise,' apply to the form of public worship and its accompanying ceremonies—not, as most have thought to be the case, to the alterations in the Second Prayer-book of Edward authorised by that Act; (3) that ceremonial acts, done without any form of words, would make the service 'other and otherwise' than was authorised, any rubrical directions notwithstanding.

Now even if we allow, yielding far more than seems to be true, that there is an 'even chance' of each of these assumptions being right, still, by the 'theory of probabilities,' the odds are heavily against the correctness of the conclusion arrived at. If the supposed meaning of 'none other and otherwise' were to be generally accepted and acted upon, the effect on the usual form of public worship would be simply appalling—a sermon must be preached at every Communion Service, no hymns could be sung except before the beginning or after the end of public services, all baptisms must be administered 'after the last lesson at morning or evening prayer,' and so forth; uniformity would be uniform indeed. For if the words hold good of ceremonial acts, much more must they apply to the saying or singing of anything which makes the actual order of service 'other' than what is set down in the Prayer-book. Even the man in the street had some inkling that this was the case, and hardly expected that such 'universal obedience' would be given to the pronouncement as an eminent prelate claimed for it. It was remembered that any acceptance of the 'Lincoln Judgment,' uttered by what claimed to be a true 'spiritual court,'⁴ had been repudiated before that decision was known. When that judgment proved, on the whole, to

⁴ In one sense, it probably was so, being—if it were anything at all—the 'Legatine Court' of the archbishop, as Legatus Natus of the Pope. But the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee (instead of the Holy See) made all the difference.

be favourable to the 'Ritualists,' the repudiation was in no way withdrawn, nor have its findings ever been claimed on our side. The only church of any note which occurs to one as having obeyed Archbishop Benson's decision is The Holy Redeemer, Clerkenwell—one cannot, of course, take account of 'extinct volcanoes' such as All Saints, Margaret Street. In the case of the two parish priests who had consented, under much pressure from their diocesans, to plead at Lambeth, it was felt that they were perhaps bound to abide by the letter of the 'Opinion,' and to yield a technical obedience to its provisions. Such an obedience, hotly denounced at the time as 'dishonest,' 'Jesuitical,' &c., was as once accepted as satisfactory by the Bishop of London; in fact, at a later date, Dr. Creighton said, 'Well, Mr. Westall, you at St. Cuthbert's have behaved *splendidly*.' Slowly but surely the feeling grew that, taken literally, the 'Opinion' was an impossible one. Broad Church ecclesiastics such as Professor Sanday, and Radical statesmen like Mr. G. W. E. Russell, agreed on this head. The ultimate outcome has been well summarised by a writer in the *Cornhill* for February:—

The Church is remarkably vigorous. That admirable liberty which its critics call licence, and which has survived a good many attempts to curb it, seems to be emerging triumphant from its latest conflict. Episcopal coercion moves . . . with a leaden foot in a velvet shoe. . . . The abolition of incense might also spell the abolition of income, and the triumph of Puritanism might disestablish the Church.

Far from being 'abolished,' a definite sanction to the use of the censer in public worship has been given by many bishops, as a direct result of the action of the two archbishops, coupled with the readiness of incumbents to obey such diocesans as consented to ignore the 'Opinion,' and to give directions on their own authority. Some of the 'uses' thus produced are strange, but every one knows that the eccentricity of usage will in the end disappear; the thurible will remain.

As to the effect of the second Lambeth pronouncement, that on Reservation, it is still too early to speak with certainty. In itself less illogical or Erastian than the former one, it deals, of course, with a far graver matter and runs counter to English canon law and to universal Catholic custom in a far more serious way. It cost us immediately one of the best-read, ablest, and most noble-minded of our priests—the ex-vicar of All Saints, Plymouth, with some less known but earnest clergy whom we can ill spare. Happily, thus far there has been no serious attempt to enforce obedience to it; the episcopal policy so neatly described in *A Londoner's Log-Book* may well be followed in this matter. I would not endorse his words as to 'abolition of income;' no one could think that Dr. Temple cares aught for income, or could doubt that Dr. Creighton had high-minded, philosophic reasons for his occasional harshness, or for his more usual forbearance. But there are signs that our prelates begin

to see how dangerous, from the highest as well as the lowest point of view, a policy of persecution or coercion might prove to be.

It would be unwise to define the present situation more sharply; we stand too close to it to see it in exact perspective; one can only foretell that as it was in the days—or, rather, *after* the days—of the Purchas Judgment, the Public Worship Act, the Lincoln Judgment, &c., so it will be again. But it may be well just to glance at some of the causes which tended to make the ecclesiastical situation what it is now.

(1) Sir William Harcourt's onslaughts. He is a born leader of lost causes, a universal solvent to the political party which he supports. Having buried Local Veto, having shattered the mighty Liberal party into fine shards, he is perhaps destined to turn England's heart away from the idols of Protestantism.

(2) The unsuspected strength of Catholic feeling among the laity, as evidenced at a certain debate at the London Church Congress, for example. Those who watched the face of the president as that discussion proceeded say that it showed first wonder, then annoyance, and at last unwilling conviction.

(3) The unmistakable failure of the 'Protestant' cry at the last General Election.

(4) The strong support given—with few, though conspicuous exceptions—by 'High Churchmen' to their 'advanced' brethren. By confounding the two sections under a common name newspaper writers tend much to weaken the force of this fact, in itself as striking as it would be to see Sir H. Fowler and Lord Rosebery hastening to the defence of Mr. Burns and Mr. Keir-Hardie. It is too often forgotten that though the president of the E.C.U. may be called the lay leader of the Catholicising party, yet the English Church Union itself is made up of men of all shades of Churchmanship, with at best a strong minority of definite 'Catholics.' So tolerant is it of 'moderation,' even in its officers, that its council decided that the only clergyman who had shown himself eager to give Holy Communion to Mr. Kensit should still hold office as its assistant secretary. But this cautious and 'comprehensive' body has definitely ranged itself on the side of the 'extremists;' an attempted protest against that policy only serving to show in how insignificant a minority were the protesters.

And perhaps one must add:

(5) A growing indifference among the general public to ecclesiastical, indeed to all religious questions.

Anyhow, the 'Crisis' is no longer exceeding critical: a calm seems to have followed the storm. We may be only in the sheltered trough of the wave before an upheaving on the next billow; but so far the threatened bark rides unsubmerged, with Kensit, Fillingham, Harcourt, *et soc.*, left swimming in the vasty deep.

Is this all that need be said as to the situation? Unhappily, no. There is one other feature of it about which it would be wrong to keep silence. There is an unsettledness among the clergy, among the younger clerics especially, which is of ill omen; in truth, there seems at last to be something of that Romeward tendency so often imagined by those outside, but now becoming a reality—for the first time in my experience. For this the bishops, and the bishops alone, are answerable. When the Pope's apostolic letter on the 'nullity' of Anglican orders produced practically no effect at all on the English clergy, almost every one was surprised. How much the archiepiscopal reply to the Papal Bull helped to bring about this steadfastness, even their Graces themselves seem hardly to have realised. But so it was: the main gist of the 'answer' lies in its declaration that Anglican priests are indeed ordained to offer that holy sacrifice which Rome calls 'the Sacrifice of the Mass'; on this head most unmistakable language is used:—

Further, we truly teach the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and do not believe it to be 'a nude commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross' . . . in celebrating the Holy Eucharist, while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered *that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ*—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as, &c.

Such a declaration, promulgated to 'the whole body of bishops of the Catholic Church,' was perhaps the most definite official statement of the oneness of the 'Church of England' (*i.e.* the Provinces of Canterbury and York) in orders and doctrine with the whole Catholic Church which has been made since the Reformation. No one could imagine Archbishops Tait and Thompson putting their names to such a document; in principles they were avowedly Erastian-Protestants; therefore any unorthodox utterances on their part would have given no shock to the clergy in their provinces.

But when our two present primates spoke as they have lately done in their recent 'Opinion' on Reservation; when especially Dr. Maclagan declared even the sub-apostolic age to be an untrustworthy time as to Eucharistic doctrine, because even then 'many superstitious views' had arisen, it was inevitable that many should be scandalised. By frank avowal that a practice owned to be at once primitive and œcumenical was forbidden amongst us, and by this seeming condemnation even of primitive doctrine, not only Catholic but also all hitherto recognised 'Anglican' landmarks were swept away; and the shock caused was not only to men of 'extreme' opinions. If the Articles of Religion, our present Book of Common Prayer, with sundry Acts of Parliament read into it ('adopted,' the

* The words I have italicised are of course quoted from the Roman Missal: 'Ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui D.N.J.C.:' they are not to be found in our present Prayer-book.

wise call it), are to be our sole guide and standard in faith and morals, what becomes of the 'continuity' with the pre-Reformation Church in England which is so loudly claimed and insisted on whenever 'Church [*i.e.* Establishment] defence' is discussed? But if that continuity be broken —?

(I apologise for a word in the last sentence: the Prayer-book, infallible as to doctrine, is *not* to be our sole guide in 'morals,' since it forbids all divorce, in the plainest words that could well be used; whereas, our bishops tell us, the 'Eastern Church' allows divorce, and the re-marriage of 'the innocent party;' English state law does the like for innocent or guilty. Therefore, to bring our practice into harmony with . . . &c. . . the Prayer-book and Canons on this one head are to be set aside.)

Who can wonder if such things cause great searchings of heart? But some have been driven to ask themselves the question, not 'Do our bishops believe in and believe one Holy Catholic Church?' but rather, 'Do some of our prelates believe in such a thing as the Church as a Divine institution at all?' Mrs. Craigie, in *Robert Orange*, puts almost these exact words into the mouth of one of her characters at the time when Dr. Temple had just been nominated to Exeter. The choice of his name is certainly unlucky; no one could doubt that *he* does so believe. But in the same book there is an utterance attributed to Lord Beaconsfield, which seems to express perfectly the fundamental mistake made by so many of our bishops — a mistake which shakes the faith and weakens the allegiance of so many devout believers.

Viewed solely (Disraeli is made to say) as a point of administration, it is disastrous to cut religious thought according to the fashionable pattern of the hour. This has been the constant weakness of English Churchmen. *They try to match eternity with the times.*

It is hardly possible to quote these words without thinking of an 'address' and a 'charge' by the late Bishop of London:—

The question which England had to settle in the sixteenth century was in what relation the system of the Church was to stand toward the aspirations of the national life. . . . The object was to reinstate the Church in its proper position as —

As what? the Kingdom of God upon earth, is the Ark of Salvation, as our Holy Mother? Oh no! as 'the trainer of national life.'

Had he been alive now, there is much that one had meant to say concerning his delusion that before the Reformation 'the sense of Communion had been almost obliterated among the people by a vicious system,' at a time when practically every one who 'had

* 'The Church of England is always "It," not "She," to most people.'—Mrs. Craigie—*Robert Orange*.

come to years of discretion' was a communicant; but this, and much else, out of respect to his memory is left unsaid.

But one comment cannot be withheld: How comes it that so clear-seeing and truthful an historian as Dr. Creighton remained blind to the lesson of the last three centuries? The Reformers wished to 'turn the mass into a Communion,' to 'make the Holy Communion a service for the people, to which they came prepared to receive the gifts of grace,' &c. So did the Council of Trent, though without mutilating the holy service of the Mass. Which plan, in the witness of history, has succeeded the better—or rather, which one succeeded, and which failed utterly? Under the Tridentine system, to communicate every Sunday—so say French ecclesiastics—is not to be reckoned as 'frequent communion;' thousands of pious souls communicate twice in the week, some daily. Even in 'atheistic' France the proportion of communicants in the average parish is much higher than it is in England; still more so the whole number of communions made in the course of a year. From the Cranmerian method came the 'Sacrament Sunday,' once in every three or four months only, with its scanty number of pious souls who 'stayed' for a service on which the general congregation turned their backs. So far from being made 'a service for the people,' the rite of the Lord's Supper became just *the* service at which millions of baptised Churchmen were never present throughout their life. However good the intentions of the Reformers may have been, in practice their system failed utterly and woefully.

Dr. Creighton has said with much truth: 'Our own time has seen a fuller accomplishment of that object. . . . The Holy Communion is more frequently . . . administered; there is a higher sense of its value, a greater recognition of its supreme importance in the services of the Church.'

Quite so; but when did this change for the better begin? With Keble's sermon on 'Eucharistic Adoration.' Which are the churches where some of the faithful come to the Lord's Table twice or thrice each week? Surely those where the daily Sacrifice has been restored; those also where the name 'Holy Communion' is used in its right meaning of the *partaking* of the Blessed Sacrament, but where the service and celebration of the Eucharist is called by its ancient name of the Mass.

Why did not so clear-sighted and unprejudiced a bishop realise this? Why, indeed, do our prelates so seldom seem to know the truth and inner meaning of what is happening around them? Why did they let slip a great opportunity some three years ago, when a strong movement towards 'filial obedience' among the Catholicising party culminated in the now forgotten Osnaburgh Conference? Why are they blind now to the 'anti-ritualistic' feeling among the 'extreme' clergy, who would gladly see such things as lighting up of

needless candles only to put them out again, choral perambulations before a confirmation, stoles worn as mere 'ribbons' by clerics in choir, &c., forbidden by episcopal authority, lawfully exercised?

To such questions I cannot venture upon an answer, but I will end with a rejoinder to the late Bishop of London's parable of the coachman and horses—one of the cleverest of his many brilliant utterances: 'True, my lord,' Mr. Westall might have replied, 'but in *a fog* the coachman, from his box, sees no further than any one else can, while the horses (poor unreasoning beasts) can at least feel the solid ground under their feet, and sometimes their instinct will lead them safely home.'

W. J. SCOTT.

AUGUSTIN RODIN

THE works of art were numerous in the *Grand Palais de l'Art* at the Paris Exhibition. A great power of idea and an extraordinary originality were necessary to make a striking impression at the first glance; it was, however, done by Rodin's marble group called 'The Kiss.' The public stood before it, surprised by something unusual, almost extraordinary, and did not know what to think of it. Is it an unfinished sketch, lacking skill and sinning by neglect? Is it an original, very original, manifestation of art? Is it a failure or a masterpiece? That group is very different from those seen around it; it overthrows all æsthetic theories of art, for it is so moving, so stimulating to thought, so unclassical, and so deeply touching man's soul. . . . That marble lives! All other statues possess, notwithstanding a great virtuosity of technique, a certain stiffness; in Rodin's group the flesh is vibrating, shivering with all nerves, it is soft and in harmony with all most secret sentiments and manifestations of the soul.

Yes, it is a masterpiece, which would be passed by with a smile of trifling by such a connoisseur of art as was Petronius, but before which would stand in admiration Paul Verlaine. It is the synthesis of the modern man, of that complicated being with its feverish passion, with delicate nerves, with longing after infinity, anxious to learn the secret of existence and to look into the depth of one's soul, to the source of sentiments. Among thousands of beautiful, harmonious statues, sometimes remarkable by force of expression, which I saw at the Exhibition, none of them expressed so powerfully the modern soul, none of them possessed such unusual marks of genius, as did 'The Kiss.'

Only very original, but philosophically inferior, works of the Prince Troubezkoï and Bartolomé could be mentioned beside Rodin's work.

When one looks on Rodin's former work, one can hardly imagine that 'The Kiss' was made by the same man, who created, beautiful, very quiet in its spiritual strength and harmony, the statue of St. John the Baptist and the elaborated bust of a lady, whose eyes look mirthfully, whose bosom seems to rise and to move the delicate lace of the bodice. The artist who reached such a perfection could rest on

his marble, and create further beautiful works not pattern-like at all and generally appreciated in that country of high culture, where he would easily find purchasers and his fame would spread just the same. But Rodin belongs to the race of continually searching and always dissatisfied people; he wished to go forward, seeking the source of new art, creating a new epoch for it, to give us that which did not yet exist, to push the human spirit in its great effort of catching Infinity and in its desire of looking at the Unknown. All his activity, all his life was and is strained to find new paths, to advance to the confines of human knowledge and means. He wished to make our limited senses broader, to make us see further, that we might look into a dizzying depth, there, where are born and where die the sentiments and passions, to catch the life in its continual movement; he wished to chisel in marble that which is rendered by modern music, viz. the cry of the soul coming out from its prison.

If one could imagine a cataclysm which would destroy all works of our civilisation, of our culture and art, if then, by some singular accident, would be spared only the *Exposition Rodin*, then the future generation would have in it the whole psychology of the man of our times—not such as he wishes to appear himself and to the world, but such as he is in his true, spiritual essence.

There are but very few people who do not retreat before the consequences of their own thoughts, and who would like to reach their sources; some instinctive fear stops us on the border of that depth; we prefer to glide on the surface of life, to keep the high-way posts, to catch the willows growing on the shores, although they are frail and breakable, rather than to swim with foaming waves, which frighten us by their noise and whirlpools; there are but few courageous and daring people, but the public is never thankful to the guides, conducting them on the large river of knowledge, in which they fear to be drowned. Only when some truth becomes known by Promethean efforts, the crowd becomes slowly accustomed to it, and recollects the man who conquered it at the cost of his own life. The axiom of the ancients, 'Know thyself,' remained always a dead letter, engraved on granite, and nobody wishes to see before him a mirror reflecting his most secret depth. By this aversion one can explain the fact that Rodin's work seems to a certain portion of the public licentious. Why? It is not for the reason that his figures are nude, for always the most conservative æsthetics considered the nudity to be a necessary element of sculpture. On the other hand, what is there more shocking in 'The Kiss' than in sensual groups of nymphs and satyrs, Venus and Mars, &c., ornamenting gardens and porticoes of palaces?

And then, Rodin does not reproduce at all the vulgar sensuality, but the rushing, foaming passion, with its fatal strength, with its delight and pain, with its warm desire for infinity, with its tragical

instability, with its presentiments of disenchantment, with its flights towards superhuman heights, and with its rolling down into a bottomless chasm.

In Rodin's special exhibition there were at least thirty groups in which the artist tried to express the problem of passion; 'she' and 'he' striving to melt by the miracle of love into one. But he succeeded only in 'The Kiss,' exhibited in the *Grand Palais*; there, the two are one; one does not know whether only for a moment or for ever, but the miracle was performed by the power of the artist's genius. In his other works one can at once notice the fruitless efforts: separation, dissonance, future full of bottomless suffering.

I take only two groups. 'Carried by the Waves' represents a nymph swimming on the billows, with a youth, who puts his arms round her neck and is dragged by her into a bottomless abyss. It is difficult to see the faces of both of them, so much they are bent; the whole tragedy of the situation is expressed in mad movements, by which they rush to peril with frightful swiftness. The other group is called 'The Kiss of the Wave,' and it symbolises the spiritual dissonance between the great soul of the man and the light, unconscious soul of the woman. On a rock kneels on one knee a young woman; a butterfly rests on her shoulder. At her feet kneels a man leaning his head on her bosom. One cannot forget the expression of his face, on which is depicted the fulness of infinite love, giving itself without any restriction, the tenderness, the softness, and in the meantime the fire of passion; on his brows one can read sublime thoughts, Titanic fights, great desire to fight with the world for ideas, but in the meantime one can notice on his mouth the traces of weariness, of the pain of life and desire for help, for support, from that woman's heart. The face of that man alone is a poem! 'She,' frightened by the grandeur that lies at her feet, perchance would like to love him with the same strength, but she does not dare to promise; she feels her incapability, she pities the kneeling man, her heart is not bad, but her soul is weak, childish, small—*animula blandula*; embarrassed, she puts one hand on the shoulders of her beloved; with the second she holds the toes of her bent foot, and she is charmingly thoughtful about her own inconstancy.

Both those works are not sketches but finished groups, deep in thought, marvellous in beautiful forms; especially the latter is one of those masterpieces about which one can think for hours.

That psychology of 'two' will be synthesised by Rodin in a great work, on which the artist has worked for ten years but has not yet finished; it is called 'The Gate of Hell.' It represents (one could see it in plaster) a gigantic door and on it bodies of men, women, and devils, all in the most various positions, representing strength, suffering, horror, and despair.

Besides the groups expressing plastically the tragedy of 'two,' there is a great number of studies of the bodies of men as well as of women, in the most difficult positions; bold, often brutal things, all made with the purpose of representing the greatest possible perfection of movement in sculpture.

I omit a great many portraits, superb by their expression and characteristics, and I pass to the group called 'Les Bourgeois de Calais.' It represents the burghers of that town handing the keys to the enemy after having exhausted all means of defence. The men, clad in long clothes, full of despair, hardly able to walk because of crushing grief, advance slowly; every face expresses complicated, painful sentiments of humiliation, of secret hatred and desire for vengeance.

That gigantic group is characterised by life, movement, expression, in, one can say, the last word of that most modern art which tries to bring out not so much the beauty and harmony of the body as the expression of the spirit, effort of sentiments, and the pulse of life.

And now let us look at the statue of Balzac, that extraordinary work, which two years ago aroused so many contradictory judgments, such a storm of discussions, and now has conquered the unfavourable public opinion and dominated that hall at the Exhibition, and the people looking at it with respect. Already at the entrance Balzac looked on you with his eagle-like deep eyes. The whole statue, when looked at from near, seems to be a block of marble leaning on one side; from a distance that block represents a short man, with broad shoulders, wrapped in a floating dress, something between a morning gown and a monk's habit, walking towards the spectator. The aim of the artist was to represent the impression of movement, and he succeeded entirely. The powerful head, set on a thick nude neck, comes out from the habit; the large square brow is that of genius; the eyes look straight, the lips are open in a smile. It seems that the great psychologist was interrupted in his work by a visit of a friend, and came to meet him in his ordinary white monkish habit which he usually wore while writing.

When one embraces Rodin's work with one glance, one notices that Balzac dominates everything, as a symbol of genius, of strength, and power; behind him Victor Hugo raises his inspired eyes, and 'The Burghers of Calais' bend their humiliated heads. All round one sees several hundred statues, busts, sketches, the gigantic result of the efforts of one man; and every one of those works, even the smallest one, tells us about the fight of spirit with matter, about the triumph of the artist's fancy and will over technical difficulties, about the triumph of a genius, and about the beginning of a new era in sculpture. And the man who produced work in such quantity and of such a quality writes to me: 'Such a sympathetic letter as yours is one of the rewards which sustain the efforts—for I am very

timorous—in my life, difficult for many sides, brightening now, but hampered just the same.' In presence of such a cry, what shall we do? Admire the sincerity, earnestness, and modesty of a great man, or be surprised at the indifference of the crowd of rich Philistines, spending lavishly money on everything except on that which is the greatest and most beautiful man can produce?

Rodin is about fifty years old, consequently he is at an age in which but a very few, even great artists, do not begin to repeat themselves. But for Rodin the general law of fulness and of decline of talent does not exist; eternal youth of spirit keeps him in the ranks of the most daring innovators, and his art is the art of the future, for it descended to the very depth of the modern man's soul and brought out its secrets. It is the art, not of muscles, but of nerves; not the art of rest, but of movement; not the art of harmony, but of continual changes. Consequently its form corresponds with its spirit: it is different from the former art; it is apparently rough and unfinished, it speaks by unrestful lines; it is based on impression, on illusion, which serves to produce impressions unknown till now in plastic art, of truth and life. This art is not the absolute property of one great man; it rises everywhere, not only in France. In the Great Palace of Art, in the hall of international sculpture, there were many works vibrating with nerves and blood, reproducing the movements of the soul, taken from life. They stood side by side with other works, created according to former traditions, which constituted an interesting contrast with the works of very modern aspirations of art, which satisfies less the sentiment of beautiful forms, but stimulates the thought; and although the works vary in their degree of talent and artistic value, collectively they are the expression of people with refined minds, disturbed spiritually, analysing themselves with painful insatiable curiosity, trying to penetrate beyond the hitherto known limits of knowledge, to enter into secret lands beyond the reach of the senses.

'There were times in the history of humanity,' said Maeterlinck, 'in which the beautiful ruled incontestably and almightily, but notwithstanding that, the soul retreated to those inaccessible depths, hid before our eyes (viz. Renaissance); there were other times, in which the soul spoke aloud through severe and childish forms (viz. twelfth and thirteenth centuries); the present time is the returning wave of manifestation of the soul.'

THE KING'S TEST DECLARATION

THE administration of the old Parliamentary Test Declaration, by way of oath, to our new Monarch, on the occasion of the opening by him of his first Parliament on the 14th of February last, caused a pang of sorrow to the Catholic peers present, followed by a respectful but earnest letter from them addressed to the Lord Chancellor. They desired to impress on him, so the letter ran, that the

expressions used in the Declaration made it difficult and painful for Catholic peers to attend to-day in the House of Lords in order to discharge their official or public duties, and that those expressions cannot but cause the deepest pain to millions of subjects of His Majesty in all parts of the Empire.

It is not to be expected that so unusual a step would have been taken without serious consideration or without good grounds. Let us peruse the Declaration in question. It runs as follows :

I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever : And that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous.¹ And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare that I do make this Declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain

¹ The accusation of superstition and idolatry against believers in transubstantiation, invocation (not *adoration*, which is a pure invention) of Virgin and Saints, and the Mass, doctrines believed in by millions of persons all over the habitable globe, might have obtained a hearing among the credulous and fanatics in the reign of Charles the Second or William of Orange, but must be scouted as ridiculous in the present age. Dr. Johnson, a staunch old Protestant, had more common sense than the framers of this Declaration. He quite understood the Catholic doctrines. In his dialogues the following occurs : *Boswell* : 'The idolatry of the Mass.' *Johnson* : 'Sir, there is no idolatry in the Mass. They believe God to be there, and they adore him.' *Boswell* : 'The worship of the Saints.' *Johnson* : 'Sir, they do not worship Saints ; they invoke them ; they only ask their prayers.' (*Life of Johnson* by Boswell, vol. i. p. 561.) Of course abuses can arise everywhere.

and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any Dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such Dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this Declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same, or declare that it was null or void from the beginning.

The history of this curious Declaration is worth attention. It was enacted as part of the famous Parliamentary Test Act of 1677 (30 Car. II. Stat. 2), and was only intended for members of Parliament, not for a monarch. Although many portions of that Statute were from time to time during the last century repealed, yet the remains of it were not abrogated until 1866, by 29 Vict. c. 19, an Act to amend the law relating to Parliamentary oaths, which repeals of it 'so much as is unrepealed.' The Declaration itself, however, was kept alive in the following way. The Bill of Rights, passed in 1689, in its tenth section extended 'it to the monarch, and requires

that every King and Queen of this realm, who at any time hereafter shall come to and succeed in the Imperial Crown of this kingdom, shall, on the first day of the meeting of the first Parliament next after his or her coming to the crown, sitting in his or her throne in the House of Peers, in the presence of the Lords and Commons therein assembled, or at his or her Coronation, before such person or persons who shall administer the Coronation Oath² to him or her, at the time of his or her taking the said oath (which shall first happen), make, subscribe, and audibly repeat the Declaration mentioned in the Statute [of 30 Car. II. Stat. 2].

Thus it will be seen that the Parliament of William and Mary did not compile the objectionable Declaration, but only adopted one invented in the reign of Charles the Second. The Declaration being ordered by the Bill of Rights to be taken, it has been continued to these days, although the Statute of Charles the Second which enacted it has been entirely abrogated since 1866.

The bitterness of the Declaration is extraordinary. It does not content itself with asserting what doctrine the person who is sworn believes in himself; for with such limit there could be no cause of offence. But the Declaration carries war into the opposite camp by gratuitously insisting (1) that so and so is the doctrine believed in by the other side, and (2) that such doctrine, so laid down by the accuser, is 'superstitious and idolatrous,' the other side being condemned without a hearing, and stigmatised as 'superstitious and idolatrous' on an *ex parte* statement.

² From this it will be seen that the Declaration will not be required to be taken again at the coronation. The Coronation Oath is prescribed by 1 Will. and Mary, sess. 1. c. 6, and is merely assertive, not accusative.

To understand the origin of this Declaration it is necessary to call to mind the acrimonious differences in politics and religion which pervaded the seventeenth century, now happily passed away. We must also remember the changes of government which followed each other rapidly during that time. The country was upset, alarmed, agitated; nor could a dispassionate view of matters be taken by any party which then held sway in Parliament.

A few years before this the country was governed by the Puritans. Next, General Monk entered into London (the 3rd of February, 1660), and commanded the existing Parliament in the name of the whole Commonwealth to issue writs within a week for the assembling of a new Parliament. Then, having secured the naval and military forces in his own hands, he sent Sir John Grenville to Brussels to advise King Charles the Second as to his (the King's) conduct, and to assure him of his services. Meanwhile the elections for the new Parliament secured everywhere returns in favour of the Royal party; the Presbyterians and Royalists were united, and called for the King's restoration. When the Convention Parliament met, Sir John Grenville was called in, bearing with him a letter from the King to the Commons. The letter was written from Breda, and offered a general amnesty (without any exceptions but such as might thereafter be made by Parliament), liberty of conscience, arbitration of all grants, purchases, and alienations, payment of the arrears of the soldiers' pay, and future pay at the same rate as they had been receiving. Such was the Declaration from Breda. Then followed, as is well known, the Proclaiming of the King in Palace Yard, at Whitehall, and at Temple Bar, ending with the entry of the King into London on the 29th of May of the same year. By a legal fiction the first year of Charles the Second's reign is called the twelfth, because he was King *de jure* on the death of King Charles the First (the 30th of January, 1649). His (Charles the Second's) reign has been termed an 'era of good laws and bad government,' but it might more truly be described as a continuous bad government, with occasional good laws, mingled with some violent, or at least questionable in their character. The 'Cavalier' or 'Pensionary' Parliament, otherwise called the 'Long Parliament of the Restoration,' which lasted from the 8th of May, 1661, to the 24th of January, 1679, 'was,' says Macaulay, 'more zealous for royalty than the King, more zealous for episcopacy than the bishops,' and their strong attachment to the Established Church and their hatred of Nonconformists continued unabated to the last.

On the accession of King Charles the Second the melancholy austerity of the Puritans fell into discredit; while the Royalists, who had ever affected a contrary disposition, augmented their gay and

fashionable manners. Doctrine fought with doctrine; prelacy was restored; all the ejected clergy were reinstated in their livings, and the liturgy of the Established Church was again admitted. The King had suffered indignities from the Scotch Presbyterians; he bore them no goodwill. In England, Prelacy and Presbytery struggled for the superiority; the 'Long Parliament' became an effective support to the former. Only fifty-six Presbyterians had obtained seats in the House of Commons, and they were powerless to oppose the measures of the majority. Bitterness was displayed against the 'Solemn League and Covenant,' which had been adopted by the English Parliament in 1643, at the desire of the Scots; it was ordered to be burnt by the common hangman. The Act of Uniformity, which required, *inter alia*, abjuration of the 'Solemn League and Covenant,' was passed in 1662, following the Corporation Act of the year before, which had struck a blow at the Presbytery by enacting that magistrates and members of corporations could not be chosen unless they had taken 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England' within one year before their election. 'These provisions,' says Hallam (*Const. Hist.* ii. 328), 'struck at the heart of the Presbyterian party, whose strength lay in the little oligarchies of the corporate towns, which directly or indirectly returned to Parliament a very large proportion of its members.' They affected other Dissenters, and also the Catholics, establishing an inequality of civil rights in favour of Established Churchmen which, so far as regards the religious test, continued until the reign of George the Fourth (1828)† when it was abolished by 9 Geo. IV. c. 17.

The King, as is well known, had married a Portuguese princess, Catherine of Braganza, in 1662, in a private room at Portsmouth, according to the rites of her (the Catholic) Church, and this, notwithstanding the disgraceful manner in which he behaved to her, may doubtless have favoured the false idea that he had himself secretly joined that religion. Be this as it may, the King's brother, the Duke of York, was a Catholic. It is therefore not surprising that the King issued the 'Declaration of Indulgence,' *dispensing*³ with the laws enacted against all Nonconformists or recusants, granting to Dissenters the public exercise of their religion, and to Catholics (O generous gift!) the exercise of it in private houses.

This unobjectionable, but to our modern eyes unconstitutional, measure, sapping the very authority of the Legislative Assembly and

* The dispensing power of the Crown was nothing new. Henry the Third was probably the first to make use of the *non obstante* clause, and his successors throughout the Plantagenet period frequently exercised both the dispensing and suspending power. The practice was derived from the Papacy, who issued Bulls '*non obstante* any law to the contrary.'

following on the secret Treaty of Dover (1670), by which the King, the Duke of York, and Louis the Fourteenth of France are said to have entered into an offensive alliance against the Established Church and civil liberties of England, provoked the spirit of Parliament, who shortly afterwards (1672) passed the famous Test Act (25 Car. II. c. 2), 'for preventing dangers which may happen from Popish recusants, and quieting the minds of His Majesty's good subjects,' requiring all persons bearing any office, civil or military, or having any place of trust under the King, to take the oaths of allegiance and royal supremacy, to receive 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the usage of the Church of England,' and to make and subscribe the following Declaration :

I, A. B., do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of Bread and Wine, at or after the Consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.*

The effect of this Act was to compel Lord Clifford to resign the office of Treasurer, and the Duke of York that of Lord High Admiral.

Six years later the Popish plot, imagined by Titus Oates and his accomplices, terrified the nation. Although Oates was a man of infamous character, as well as very versatile in his belief, being originally an Anabaptist, then a clergyman of the Established Church, next a Catholic, and subsequently expelled from the English College at St. Omer, and although, when examined before the Council, he betrayed his impostures in the grossest manner, making contradiction after contradiction, yet the public, still disturbed by the recollection of the tragic death of Charles the First, unhinged by the rapid changes of Monarchy to Commonwealth, and again to Restoration, and suspicious of the honesty of the King's relations with France, easily swallowed the bait; the accusation of Oates was believed, and a most violent animosity was on all sides excited against the Catholics. The more diabolical any contrivance appeared, the more probable it seemed to the excited populace. The murder of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey completed the delusion.

When Parliament met, the Earl of Danby, formerly Thomas Osborne, who hated the Catholics, brought forward the question of further defence against so-called Popish plots. His furious cry was echoed from one House to another. Parliament gave its sanction to a further Test Bill far more comprehensive than that of 1672. By this a *Parliamentary* test was imposed which for the first time excluded Catholic peers⁵ from Parliament, members of the House of

* This oath does not fall within the strictures of the Parliamentary Test Oath, as it contents itself with asserting what doctrine the person who is sworn believes in himself. It does not offer to inform others what their doctrines are.

⁵ The peers excluded were—*Dukes*: Norfolk. *Earls*: Shrewsbury, Berkshire,

Commons having practically been excluded by the Act of Queen Elizabeth (5 Eliz. c. 1).⁶

This Parliamentary Test Act, known as 30 Car. II. Stat. 2, was passed in 1677; it was especially aimed at the Duke of York. It is entitled 'An Act for the more effectual preserving of the King's Person and Government, by disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament,' and enacts that—

Forasmuch as divers good laws have been made for preventing the increase and danger of Popery in this Kingdom, which have not had the desired effects, by reason of the free access which Popish recusants have had to His Majesty's Court, and by reason of the liberty which of late some of the recusants have had and taken to sit and vote in Parliament:

Wherefore, and for the safety of His Majesty's Royal Person and Government, be it enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and of the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the first day of December which shall be in the year of our Lord God One thousand six hundred seventy and eight, no person that now is, or hereafter shall be, a Peer of the Realm, or Member of the House of Peers, shall vote, or make his proxy in the House of Peers, or sit there during any debate in the said House of Peers; nor any person that now is, or hereafter shall be, a Member of the House of Commons, shall vote in the House of Commons, or sit there during any debate in the said House of Commons after their Speaker is chosen; until such Peer or Member shall from time to time respectively, and in manner following, first take the several oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, and make, subscribe, and audibly repeat this Declaration following.

Here follows the Declaration set out at p. 698. The Act then provides that any member of Parliament who shall not take the above-mentioned oaths is thereby forbidden to come into the presence of the King and Queen, and that the servants of the King and Queen shall take the same oaths, subject to a proviso in favour of nine Portuguese men-servants in attendance on the Queen and a like number of women-servants similarly employed. The attack on the Duke of York, however, failed, for he was unexpectedly excepted from the mischief of the Act, although only by a majority of two votes.

Encouraged by the fury and terror excited in the populace through his fraud, and by the easy manner in which Parliament had been deceived, Oates next ventured to accuse the Queen herself. This was indeed going too far; and although the Commons were again snared, the Lords chivalrously refused to listen to the foul calumny.

Portland, Cardigan, and Powis. *Viscounts*: Montagu and Stafford. *Lords*: Mowbray, Audley, Stourton, Petre, Arundell, Hunsdon, Bellasyse, Langdale, Teynham, Carrington, Widdrington, Gerard of Bromley, and Clifford. Three recreants took the oath; I shall not mention their names.

⁶ These disabilities were not removed until the close of the reign of George the Fourth by the Catholic Relief Bill (10 Geo. IV. c. 7), 1829.

Another attack, however, was directed against the Duke of York in 1679, a Bill called the Exclusion Bill being introduced to exclude him from the throne on the sole ground of his being a Catholic. Intense public agitation was caused by the Bill, and it is interesting to note that the names Whig and Tory were then first applied to the two political parties. The King having dissolved Parliament on the 27th of May in order to quash the Bill, rival parties were formed, called 'Petitioners' and 'Abhorrrers,' supporting and abhorring respectively the action of the King; these afterwards became Whigs and Tories. Judgment at length overtook the infamous Titus Oates. In Hilary Term, 1685, he was found guilty on two indictments for perjury. The court in passing sentence lamented that he could not be made to suffer death in return for the innocent blood which he had caused to be shed by his perjuries.

In the same year the King died, and the Duke of York succeeded under the title of James the Second. He went openly to Mass with all the insignia of dignity; nevertheless all the chief offices of the Crown continued in the hands of members of the Established Church. Moreover, both he and his Queen were crowned in Westminster Abbey by the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury,⁷ the Holy Communion and a few minor ceremonies being omitted. There was, however, no request made to King James the Second to make the Declaration which King Edward the Seventh has lately made, because it will be observed the Statute of 1677 (30 Car. II. Stat. 2) then only applied to members of the two Houses of Parliament and to the royal servants, but not to the monarch.

It is unnecessary to dilate on the miserable reign and on the mingled violence and craft of James the Second. It is really a pity that the Act of Exclusion did not pass. His conduct more and more inflamed the popular feeling against the Catholics. He prepared the nation for the advent of William Prince of Orange, who, with his Queen, took possession of the vacant throne by virtue of the Resolution of both Houses of Parliament of the 13th of February, 1689, embodied in the Bill of Rights, after having exercised a provisional government over the kingdom during the previous year (1688).

The preamble of the Bill of Rights narrates clearly and fully the violation of the known laws of the realm which the late King

⁷ This may appear strange. There, however, is a precedent furnished by Sigismund the Third, King of Poland, who on his accession to the throne of Sweden was, after consultation with Catholic theologians, crowned by the Archbishop of Upsala, a Lutheran prelate. The distinction seems to be that the coronation was considered as a *civil* ceremony.

had committed, and it establishes guarantees against similar wrongs. This Statute (1 Will. & Mary, sess. 2, c. 2) has for its full title, 'An Act for Declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and Settling the Succession of the Crown.' This Act, after reciting that 'it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of the Protestant kingdom to be governed by a Popish prince, or by any King or Queen marrying a Papist,' enacts that

all and every person and persons that is, are, or shall be reconciled to, or shall hold communion with, the See or Church of Rome, or shall profess the Popish religion, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded, and be for ever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown and Government of this Realm and Ireland, and the dominions thereunto belonging, or any part of the same, or to have, use, or to exercise any regal power, authority, or jurisdiction within the same; and in all and every such case or cases the people of these realms shall be, and are hereby, absolved of their allegiance, and the said Crown and Government shall from time to time descend to, and be enjoyed by, such person or persons, being Protestants, as should have inherited and enjoyed the same in case the said person or persons so reconciled, holding communion, or professing or marrying as aforesaid, were naturally dead.

And by Sec. 11 :

All which . . . shall stand, remain, and be the law of this realm for ever.

Such is the history of the Declaration which was tendered to His Majesty on the occasion of the opening of his first Parliament, and which he took according to law. Nor had he any option. For, as Portia says :

The court awards it, and the law doth give it.

It will have been observed, in the foregoing pages, that the Puritans and the Presbytery had in their time to suffer persecution as well as the Catholic party. It was an age of persecution. Those days of bigotry are passed. But the aspersions contained in the Declaration remain, and it would be desirable if the Declaration could be omitted, or at least amended. The aspersions are untrue and impolitic. Untrue, as the subjoined extracts* testify. Impolitic,

* Extract from the *Catechism* of the Rev. Henry Gibson (Catholic Priest), 3rd edition : 'The bread and wine are called the matter of the Sacrament, the words of consecration its form, and they both together make up the outward sign. As soon as the words of consecration are pronounced, the substance of the bread and wine is no longer present, for it has been changed by the power of God into the Body and Blood of His Divine Son. But the appearances of the bread and wine still remain as a sensible sign of the precious treasure of our Lord's Body and Blood, which are there contained, though hidden from our bodily eyes.' Again he says : 'To God alone we pay Divine worship, but to the Saints and Angels we show a lesser reverence for the sake of God, whose friends and servants they are. Thus we adore God, but we do not adore them ; we ask God to pardon our sins, but we do not ask pardon from the Saints and Angels ; we beg blessings and grace from God, but we only ask the Saints and Angels to use their power and favour with God to obtain for us from Him what we stand in need of.'

because, the popular terror which inspired them having been spent two hundred years ago, they only serve now to cause pain to millions of His Majesty's faithful and loyal servants throughout the globe.

Without wishing to trench on purely theological grounds, it may not be irrelevant to add that the doctrines of Transubstantiation, the Invocation of the Saints, and the Mass, although qualified in the Declaration by the words 'as they are now used in the Church of Rome' (whatever may be the value of that sentence), are not only believed by the Catholic, but also by the Greek Church, and by the Russo-Greek Church,⁹ including the King of Greece and the Czar of Russia. The doctrines are believed in by all the Oriental Churches, whether in communion, or out of communion, with Rome. The doctrines are older than the history of this country. They are to be found in the Liturgy of St. James—that is, the Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, venerable for its antiquity, and spread all over Syria. They are to be found in the Liturgy of St. Mark, the ancient rite of the Church of Alexandria, employed among the orthodox Christians of Egypt. The same may be said of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, the liturgy or euchology followed by all the Greek Christians and by the Russian Church, as well as by the Georgians, the Mingrelians, and the Bulgarians. The same may be said of the Syriac Liturgy of St. Basil, as well as of the Coptic Liturgy of St. Basil, used by the Eutychians, and the same of the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Basil.

According to the Declaration,* all these liturgies, and those adhering to them, are 'superstitious and idolatrous,' including St. Chrysostom, St. James, and St. Basil.

But enough of satire. Granted the Protestant succession to the Throne of this country, granted all its natural and necessary concomitants, as fully set out by the Bill of Rights and in every

* Extract from the *Catechism of the Orthodox Eastern Church*, examined and approved by the Holy Synod of Russia: 'Q. What is the most solemn and the most remarkable act of this office? R. It is when the celebrant pronounces the words which Jesus Christ pronounced Himself when he instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist: "Take and eat, this is my body; drink ye all, for this is my blood, the blood of the new Covenant" (Matt. xxvi. 26-28); then the invocation of the Holy Ghost which follows, and the blessing of the species, that is to say, of the bread and wine. Q. Why is this moment the most important of the Mass? R. Because it is at this moment precisely that occurs the change, or Transubstantiation, of the consecrated bread and wine, become the real Body and Blood of Christ.' Again it says: 'The faithful belonging to the Church Militant on earth address their prayers to God, invoking the intercession of the Saints, members of the Church Celestial. In the same way those who have arrived to the degree the nearest to the throne of the Divinity intercede for us by their prayers, and purify, fortify, and offer to God the prayers of the faithful living on earth. . . . The Orthodox Church addresses itself to Jesus Christ, our true God, by the prayers of his most Holy Mother and of all the saints.'

other possible way, is it not time that the odious Declaration, like some musty coat-armour preserved in a museum as a relic of antiquity, should now be cleared off the Statute-book, and a new Declaration, more dignified and more befitting the knowledge and progress of the twentieth century, should be substituted in its stead ?

GEO. SHERSTON BAKER.

LORD CURZON IN INDIA

WITH their eyes fixed anxiously for a year and more on a long and eventful conflict in South Africa, it was perhaps not to be wondered at if Englishmen at home have paid even less heed than they are wont to what was going on in India. This is no doubt the explanation, why so little has been heard of the work Lord Curzon is accomplishing there; and it may also account for the circumstance that when, on one or two occasions, his policy has been misrepresented, or his actions misunderstood, the necessary refutation has not been readily forthcoming. But, ignored though they may have been, Indian affairs were seldom more interesting than at the present juncture. There is, indeed, no crisis; no appeal is made to our attention by wars and tumults and the brave music of the distant drum. The reign of Queen Victoria witnessed, indeed, a succession of hard-fought campaigns in India and the countries adjacent, but at its close the land was hushed in peace. The significance of the situation to-day is to be sought for rather in the record of administrative work, in the measure of success which has attended the efforts of a young and energetic Viceroy to infuse his own vigour into every branch of the Government, and more especially in the details, just made public in a Blue Book, of a momentous and far-reaching scheme for reorganising the political control and defence of the North-West frontier.

It used to be said of Indian Viceroys, and not without justice, that they spend the first two years of their reign in computing the dimensions of the Indian problem, the third in considering where best to attack it, and the remainder of their term in deciding with more or less depression to leave it alone. Perhaps in most cases this may be a prudent, though it would scarcely be called a courageous resolution. No such hesitancy marked the advent of Lord Curzon. From the date of his first arrival in the City of Palaces on the Hugli, and of his replies to the various welcomes, not unmingled with flattering hopes and vain requests, that are showered upon a new ruler, he showed that he was no griffin in the land, but that he had already sown the seed of wisdom by studying its questions, and had a policy and a programme in his pocket. The buoyant

confidence of a ruler who was ~~held to~~ walk by himself the first hour afforded a not displeasing contrast to the timid truisms and the guarded amenities with which most Indian Viceroys are apt to inaugurate, and may continue to punctuate, the annals of their placid reigns.

In his first Budget speech at Calcutta in March 1899, Lord Curzon announced that there were twelve important and greatly needed reforms to which he proposed to turn his attention. What they were he refrained with diplomatic obscurity from communicating to his audience. At the same time, it is open to any one, from the evidences of public action, to hazard a conjecture as to what some at least of the twelve labours of our Indian Herakles must be. One may also make a shrewd guess at a few undertakings which will not be included in the list. When Lord Curzon went out from England, Radical newspapers informed us that we were going to have a very Forward Policy on the Frontier—something, indeed, which might be described as all forwardness and no policy at all. The Tirah campaign of Lord Elgin's Administration would be child's play compared with the new embarrassments. Our friend and ally the Amir would be estranged; and we might presently find ourselves engaged in a mortal struggle with the Cossacks on the Oxus. The new Viceroy was to be a puppet in the hands of the military party, and was to display a sort of combination of the worst features of Lords Ellenborough and Auckland. Sensible and well-informed people were not, perhaps, unduly perturbed by these prophecies. Those who happened to have dipped into Lord Curzon's books and writings had long thought that they showed a surer grasp of the situation than any modern work on the subject. It seemed reasonable to hope that the man who had devoted years of his life to a patient examination of the frontier question on the spot, who had ridden through the Pamirs, and Persia, and Afghanistan, had visited the Russians in Central Asia and the Amir at Kabul, who had stayed with Sandeman at Quetta and with the Mehtar-ul-Mulk at Chitral, was more likely to know what he was about than the self-styled experts who, deriving their information as a rule from the Continental Press, expounded and explained the Indian frontier question till the real elements of the problem, so far as the general public was concerned, were altogether obscured. The confidence placed in Lord Curzon was not belied. With the exception of isolated raids and counter-moves, there has been absolute peace upon the frontier for two years. In Dir and Swat—the old centre of intrigue and rebellion—there has been quiet. The Mohmunds and Afridis abide in peace. The Orakzais are friendly. Only the Waziris, who never felt the full weight of the British hand, have been openly contumacious, owing, I am inclined to think, to certain laxities in the method of dealing with them, for which Lord Curzon's Administration is in no

way responsible. And even this little frontier trouble is likely to be settled, and the Waziris brought to their senses, without anything more serious than a blockade. This operation, by-the-by, is on such an unusual scale that a few particulars may not be out of place. The blockade was recommended and is being directed by Mr. Merk, the Commissioner of the Derajat—a frontier officer trained in Cavagnari's school who knows more of the borderland than most people. It extends 200 miles, from Wana by way of Tonk and Bannu to Datta Kheyl at the head of the Tochi Pass; and to the Waziri it means that, until he and his tribe have paid up the whole of the fine demanded as a penalty for their misdeeds, not a bullock-load of the goods they usually get from India will reach them. They cannot buy tobacco, or cloth, or *ghur*; the price of grain is rising steadily, and salt costs three times as much as it used to. Already the pressure thus exerted is beginning to have its effect; and according to the latest accounts the tribal *maliks* were paying instalments of the fine at the rate of 500 rupees a day.

To return, however, to the general lines on which Lord Curzon's frontier policy is being developed. One of his first steps was to remove from the minds of the tribesmen the suspicion aroused by the costly schemes for advanced fortifications, trans-frontier railways and garrisons which had been accepted by Lord Elgin's Government. First the British and afterwards the Native troops were withdrawn from Lundi Kotal; and the project of a Khyber railway, at which the Afridis were really alarmed, was abandoned in favour of a modest extension of the existing trunk line from Peshawar to Jumrud. The garrison in Chitral was reduced by one-half, and instead of building extensive fortifications at the capital, concentration was effected at Drosh, at the near or Indian end of the line. Meanwhile, though trans-frontier railways were shelved, a definite scheme of cis-frontier lines took their place. It was evidently the opinion of the Viceroy that, while isolated tentacles thrown out beyond the border are calculated to irritate and alarm, a network of supporting lines behind the advanced base is a necessary source of strength. Accordingly, a railroad has been built from Nowshera to Dargai in support of the Malakand position. The Jumrud extension similarly supports the Khyber. Kohat has been strengthened by the opening of the Kohat Pass Road, a means of direct communication of which the difficulties have frightened off our statesmen for half a century. The engineers have been making the final surveys for a railroad from Kushalgarh on the Indus to Kohat; and it is understood that this is to be prolonged in the direction of Thull on the Kurram River.

These railroads, however, as is pointed out in the *Allahabad Pioneer*, are only the secondary links in a chain of frontier policy. The primary link is even more important. This is nothing less

than the gradual substitution, for the regular garrisons maintained in scattered forts and posts beyond the administrative border of India, of bodies of Tribal Militia, raised from the tribes themselves for the military defence of their own hills and valleys. These Militia are not local levies in the old sense of the term. They do not provide their own horses or arms; they are not organised or commanded by their own petty chiefs. They are, on the contrary, semi-military bodies, on the model of the well-known Khyber Rifles. Raised in fixed proportions from the trans-border and cis-border clans, they are drilled and commanded by British officers, earn approximately the same pay as the Sepoy, and are, in fact, irregular contingents of the Native Army. Bodies of these men have been or are still being raised along the entire length of the North-West frontier from Chitral to Beluchistan. When they have reached the requisite pitch of discipline, they will gradually take the place of the isolated British detachments, who will be withdrawn from the detestable duties of trans-frontier garrison life, and restored to the mobile strength of the Indian Army. Each section of the tribal area will then, under the new system, be garrisoned and defended, for the most part, by its own inhabitants.

The principle underlying these measures may be briefly summed up in a few words borrowed from the elaborate and statesmanlike Minute by Lord Curzon, dated the 27th of August, 1900, which is included in the Blue Book just presented to Parliament. They are intended to extricate from advanced positions the large number of regular troops stationed there, for some years past; to consolidate instead of dispersing our military strength upon the border; and to set up, as it were, the sentiment of local co-operation by enlisting, for the defence of their own country but in the service of the British Government, the wild yet not wholly intractable inhabitants of the border. These measures are now, where not completely carried out, in a fair way to be. There is, however, another and, in some respects, a more momentous reform which has yet to be noticed—namely, the removal of frontier management from the hands of the Punjab Government, and the creation of a new administrative charge under a high official—assisted, of course, by a large staff of English and native subordinates—who will be responsible directly to the Government of India. The main purpose of the Minute just quoted is to indicate the lines on which the Viceroy proposes to carry out this reorganisation, and his reasons for regarding it as the only means of finally removing the complexities, the anomalies, and the ineradicable flaws of the existing system. He describes it, in fact, as ‘the keystone of the frontier arch.’ Lord Curzon’s proposals have been approved, generally, by His Majesty’s Government, and the Secretary of State has intimated that the details, when worked out, will receive his favourable

consideration. There has been a good deal of misapprehension about the scheme. It is not an endeavour to revive Lord Lytton's plan of a great Frontier Administration which should 'gather up into a single skein the many and complex threads of the whole of the North-West and West frontier of the Indian Empire.' An idea of that kind, the Viceroy drily remarks, might still appeal to the imagination of an enthusiast, but it is not practical. There is to be no powerful Warden of the Marches, whose word would be law from the Black Mountain to the Indian Ocean, in the Bolan as well as in the Khyber, at Quetta as much as at Peshawur. On the other hand, the Chief Commissioner and Agent to the Governor-General in the new Frontier province will exercise authority over a wide stretch of territory. His charge is to include the British Districts of Peshawur, Kohat, Bannu and Dera Ismail Khan, and the control of the Indian Government's relations with the adjacent hill tribes. Dir, Swat, and Chitral, as well as the Khyber, Kurram, the Tochi Pass, and Wana will be 'in his beat' as Agent to the Governor-General; while the Punjab districts mentioned will be administered by him as Chief Commissioner. His status will be analogous to that of Colonel Yate, Chief Commissioner and Agent to the Governor-General in Baluchistan.

The project for the creation of a Punjab Frontier province, separated from the Government of the Punjab proper, has been more or less in the air for some time past. Lord Lytton's comprehensive scheme, which was meant to include the trans-Indus portions of the Punjab, Baluchistan, and Sind, was pared down by the India Office till the late Sir C. Aitchison, then Foreign Secretary, declared that it would be difficult to devise anything 'more full of the seeds of future misunderstanding, confusion, and divided responsibility.' Lord Lytton, however, was prepared to go on with it, even as amended, on the principle, the present Viceroy thinks, that half a loaf seemed better than no bread. But the outbreak of the Afghan War led to its being first shelved for a time and then abandoned. Lord Lansdowne, before he left India, placed on record his opinion that all the circumstances pointed 'to the creation of a single Frontier charge . . . under the immediate direction of the Government of India.' Later still, after the Tirah campaign, Lord George Hamilton informed the Indian authorities that, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, 'it is desirable that the conduct of the external relations with the tribes on the Punjab Frontier should be more directly under the control of the Government of India.' 'To secure this end the Secretary of State suggested a plan which almost exactly reproduced the compromise which, twenty-one years earlier, had been sent out to Lord Lytton. In fact, like Mr. Chick, in *Dombey and Son*, the India Office once again asked: 'Couldn't something temporary be done with a tea-

pot.' As already explained, Lord Curzon objects both to half-loaf compromises and temporary tea-pots, and has worked out a plan of wholesale reform which commands the approval both of his advisers on the spot and of the authorities at home.

That the project, in its main outlines, leaves no opening for adverse criticism is, I think, generally admitted. The existing system had been condemned over and over again. The only remedy for the interminable friction and delays was to end the game of cross purposes by separating the frontier from the area controlled by the Provincial Government at Lahore. At the same time nothing will be gained by trying to minimise the difficulties involved in the change. Some of those who have accepted it with applause seem to think that the Punjab border can quite easily be run on the same lines as the Quetta Agency, with its population of no more than a couple of hundred thousand inhabitants, living in a fairly simple if barbarous social state, and with a revenue of two lakhs or so. The British territory, inhabited by British subjects, which will be placed under the new Frontier Chief Commissioner, covers an area of nearly 10,700 square miles, with a population of over 1,360,000 'turbulent devils' as a frontier officer describes them, and with a revenue of eighteen and three-quarter lakhs. It is an area including densely populated tracts like Peshawur and Bannu. It has a complicated system of land tenure and civil and criminal law; and the people, for fifty years, have lived under a system founded on precedents of which a large part will now count for nothing. The new Chief Commissioner, besides the work he has to do among the tribes beyond the administrative frontier, will have a most difficult task before him within the border line. The Viceroy, in his Minute, rightly argues that it is impossible to separate 'Hill politics from Plain politics;' but it will be no easy matter, under the new system, to maintain the balance of the combination. These reflections, however, are not meant to suggest doubts as to the wisdom of the policy resolved on, but rather to indicate the dimensions of the problem which Lord Curzon has so courageously assailed. There is ample evidence in the Blue Book that he is not unconscious of the obstacles in his path; and, aided by the loyal and capable lieutenants whom he cannot fail to select for the work, we may look to him with confidence to push it through.

It is worthy of note, as a feature of his frontier policy, that Lord Curzon has plainly desired to attach to himself the frontier chieftains, in whose hands lies so much power for good or evil, by personal bonds. In former days he visited and stayed with many, if not most of them, in their own homes. A winter ago Calcutta had the pleasure of seeing the whole of the Hindu Kush chieftains, who were brought down to the capital of the Indian Empire to spy out the wonders of the land, and to be entertained by their former

guest. In the course of his last frontier tour along the Beluch and Pathan border, the *tumandars* and *maliks* were similarly sent for and personally presented to the Viceroy, who spoke to each in turn. In the Durbar at Quetta, appropriately held in the Memorial Hall erected in honour of his old friend, Sir Robert Sandeman, his Excellency addressed the assembled Khans and Sirdars of Beluchistan in terms of frank but friendly directness, such as they had never previously listened to from Viceregal lips.

The attitude adopted by the Viceroy towards the tribal and frontier chieftains is not unlike that which he has taken up towards the princes and feudatory chiefs of India in general. Judging by the signs of the times, it looks as if he had embarked upon a policy which may leave a more lasting mark upon India than any other reform. In England the full meaning and scope of the distinction between Native India with its 70 millions of people and its 600 chiefs, and British India with its 230,000,000 of inhabitants, administered by the Civil Service, are often overlooked. From time to time a few of the Princes, speaking English fluently, beautifully dressed and turned out, interested if not proficient, in English sports, and apparently fired with a genuine enthusiasm for Occidental civilisation, make their way to Europe. It is too hastily assumed that they are types of the system; and that the whole Prætorian Guard of Native Princes is marching shoulder to shoulder on the road of moral and material advancement. In India one sees a very different side of the picture. Some of the Princes, by their ability and patriotism, have justified their ancient lineage, their high rank, or their modern education. But there are others who, either because their education has been neglected, or mismanaged, or arrested, or ignored, have developed into extravagant ne'er-do-wells; sometimes into much worse. One sees them surrounded by hordes of parasites (of whom the low-class Europeans are the most nefarious), spending mints of money on jewels and luxuries, and gradually forfeiting the respect and affection of their subjects. It is not altogether or mainly their own fault; for the Indian Government has never made up its mind how to treat them. It insists upon giving them some sort of education in their youth, and tries to turn them into English public school-boys and gentlemen. Having implanted a taste for sport, and having broken down most of the old restraints of caste and religion, it then places these young men in the seats of the mighty, and announces that, short of evidence of positive misrule, it is precluded by *sunmuds* and treaties from interfering any further with its recent pupils. It combines the maximum of interference, before the young man is twenty, with the minimum afterwards. It expects a chief to be both an orthodox Hindu, or a devout Mussulman, and a gentleman of the nineteenth century. Having been taught to look upon Europe as the fountain-head of all light, he is expected to rule a

Native State where there is a good deal of darkness visible. If he is not a ruling chief, but only the scion of a ruling or noble family, he is sent adrift—just at the moment when his English counterpart would be passing from the public school or the university into one of the honourable professions—with no prospects before him and nothing whatever to do. He cannot go into the Army because the British Government does not allow it. He cannot go to the Bar, because such a step would involve the loss of all dignity and self-respect. He cannot become a doctor, or an architect, or an engineer, because all professions are unprincipled. He cannot even develop into a society painter or minor poet, or man of letters, since art and literature have played no part in his education. He becomes an uneasy anachronism, living sometimes upon the income of his State or family, sometimes upon the bounty of Government, and drifting gradually but surely to the bad.

Lord Curzon has manifestly set himself to grapple with this problem—and not a moment too soon. He has seen that the Native Prince can only be maintained if he is utilised, and that he cannot be utilised by being left alone. He must be taught to recognise himself as a factor not merely in the government of his own State, but in the Imperial administration. The Native States, in fact, must no longer be regarded as a collection of quaint and ancient *bric-à-brac* on the shelves of a curiosity-shop, nor even as a picturesque protuberance upon the British system. They are part of that system, contributing to its stability, but dependent upon it for continued existence. This was the spirit in which Lord Curzon addressed the young Maharaja Scindia—a model of the best type of prince—in his speech at Gwalior, when he said:—

The Native chief must learn that his revenues are not secured to him for his own selfish gratification but for the good of his subjects; that his internal administration is only exempt from correction in proportion as it is honest; and that his *gadi* is not intended to be a divan of indulgence, but the stern seat of duty. His figure should not merely be known on the polo-ground, or on the race-course, or in the European hotel. These may be his relaxations, and I do not say that they are not legitimate relaxations. But his real work, his princely duty, lies among his own people.

In strict pursuance of the same ideal there appeared a few months ago the Viceroy's Circular Letter about the European tours of Native Princes. No one can question the courage, and in India few disputed the opportuneness or the wisdom, of this bold pronouncement. It was understood and applauded by the better class of chiefs; for while it will hit the spendthrift and the absentee, it gives encouragement to the old-fashioned chief, who has not been caught by the flood-tide of modern civilisation, and who prefers to be a good Indian rather than a bad copy of an Englishman. But, as some of the Native papers have pointed out, it is to be hoped that Lord

Curzon will not stop here. If he means to restrict opportunities for extravagance and frivolity, he ought also to reform the agencies by which these tastes are implanted. If he declines to let the chiefs career about the world and amuse themselves, he must see that they have some worthy occupation in their own country. If they are not to waste their money abroad, it is not quite consistent to allow them to squander it at home. That the Viceroy can encourage as well as be severe is shown by his attitude towards those Princes who have risen to a high conception of their public duty. While he pointedly passed by the State of Indore in his tour through the Central Indian States without a word to the Maharaja Holkar, whose misrule and eccentricities are but too well known, he spent three days at Gwalior, and, on the outbreak of troubles in the Far East, he permitted the young Maharaja to proceed with his hospital-ship to China. A similar compliment was paid to the youthful Maharaja of Bikanir. An entirely new development, which may be pregnant of future consequences, and which has produced a great sensation in India, has been given to Lord Dufferin's scheme of Imperial Service Troops by the permission for the first time accorded to them by Lord Curzon to serve outside the borders of India. Hitherto they have only been employed on lines of communication in frontier campaigns. Now the Viceroy has let them go to the front in China. This is the first line of a new chapter in Imperial history. By such incentives Lord Curzon has produced a stir and thrill among the old Indian aristocracy that not for long have they known. On the other hand, he did not hesitate to depose the Maharaja of Bhurtpore when that Prince shot his body servant dead in a fit of temper. There is consequent trepidation among the bad chiefs. But there is hope and rejoicing among the better sort. To no part of Lord Curzon's work do those who are interested in India look forward with greater interest than to the development of his policy towards the Princes and their States.

Little space is left to speak about the indications of the Viceroy's programme that may be gathered from his speeches or actions with regard to education, concerning which he is known to entertain strong views; the wider extension of irrigation as a protection—it cannot be a preventive—against famine; the finding of some suitable sphere of employment for the evergrowing class of persons of mixed English and Indian descent, about which he made a notable speech at Calcutta last spring; the promotion of indigenous industries, for whose benefit he passed the Countervailing Duties on Sugar Bill; the reduction of telegraphic charges between Great Britain and India, a reform which seems to be on the verge of achievement; the relief of the indebtedness of the agricultural classes, in whose interest has recently been passed a very momentous Act for arresting the alienation of land in the Punjab; or the endowment

of India with a gold standard, an experiment which, though still in its infancy, has so far been attended with gratifying success. *

Finally, there is a phase of policy and conduct in which the Viceroy, in the face of much criticism and at the risk of serious unpopularity, has gone fearlessly on his way. India is a country in which, even on the threshold of the twentieth century, the racial feeling is very strong. The older men say that it tends to grow not better, but worse. An evidence of the truth of this appreciation seems to be supplied by the increasing number of cases of violent collision between Europeans and Natives. Sometimes the *fracas* is between some soldiers out shooting and a band of native villagers; sometimes between the soldier in his barracks and the coolie who pulls, or neglects to pull, his punkah; sometimes between British officials and their native subordinates; sometimes between managers of tea-gardens and the labourers on their estates. There is a good deal to be said on both sides of the question. The Native Press complains of the arrogant temper of the European, and declares that there is one law for the white and 'another for the black—an assertion which the result of criminal trials where a European is the accused party does not tend to disprove. The European Press protests against the increasing insolence of the Native, and demands full protection for the rights and dignity of the ruling race. The situation thus created is not precisely a garden of roses in which a Viceroy would choose to saunter. He can win little credit; he may provoke much animosity; he cannot be quite sure of the result.

Nevertheless, Lord Curzon has not shrunk from letting it be known what his line is. He has made it clear that, so far as rests with him, he will insist upon even justice between the two races, and that stern punishment shall be meted out to the offender, whatever his colour or his creed. It is well known that but for his attitude in the Rangoon outrage case the whole of that disgraceful affair would have been hushed up. He was attacked in some quarters for the Order in Council that gave public expression to the feelings of the Government of which he was the head. But the majority of thinking persons welcomed the assertion by the supreme authority of its resolve to uphold the highest standard of moral duty. The Viceroy spoke in language of similar plainness in the Government resolution upon what was known as the Chupra scandal, where some European officers had attacked and grossly persecuted a Native. More recently a committee of combined soldiers and civilians was convened by him to revise the Shooting Pass Rules, the neglect or contempt of which had been responsible for much of the trouble between Englishmen and Natives. It is very easy to hint, as was done by one critic, that the Viceroy has an eye upon the conventicles at home. I doubt if Lord Curzon cares much about

the applause of Exeter Hall; or, if he did, whether it would compensate any Governor-General for the serious attacks of his own countrymen in India. That Lord Curzon has hitherto escaped the latter risk is evidence of the public recognition of his motives. That he will permanently improve the relations between the two races is more than can be expected of any one man in five years. That he will leave them better than he found them is the common hope of both.

STEPHEN WHEELER.

LAST MONTH

THE statesmen who are responsible, more or less, for the government of Great Britain could hardly be accused of rhetorical exaggeration if, like Hamlet, they were to declare that the times are out of joint. It might have been hoped that after the grave and agitating experiences of January and February we should have had a respite from public anxieties in March. But the old saw about unfinished questions has again proved true, and the course of events shows no pity for the repose of nations—or, at least, of this nation in particular. The outlook abroad has been singularly gloomy and disquieting throughout the month. On the Continent there has been, in several quarters, a fresh outburst of that ill-will which so many of our European neighbours delight to show towards us. In the United States, Senator Morgan, as the chosen apostle of spread-eagleism, has once more given utterance to the sentiments of Jefferson Brick, amid the applause of the Yellow Press and its readers. In China, whilst but little progress has been made in the solution of the main problem with which the united Powers are dealing, a local squabble at Tientsin over the trumpery question of a railway-siding has all but caused a collision between bodies of Russian and English troops; whilst in South Africa the pursuit of the guerilla forces has been maintained in a tedious and unsatisfactory fashion, and the attempt to negotiate terms of surrender with General Botha has resulted in a distinct failure.

If there were not enough in this outlook abroad to justify the apprehensions of statesmen, a survey of home affairs would be more than sufficient to complete that justification. Parliament has been sitting for little more than a month, but already one unpleasant fact with regard to our Parliamentary institutions has been forced upon our notice. This is the decay in reputation and influence of the House of Commons. To many of us, firm believers in the Constitution and in the principles of representative government, this is the saddest of all the facts which now confront us. Heaven help our country if Parliament should fall into public contempt! This is the sentiment which rises to the lips when we contemplate the possibility

of a change that would be more revolutionary than any other that it is possible to conceive. We may still be a long way from the moment when the House of Commons shall have laid down the sceptre it has wielded through so many centuries; but it is impossible for thinking men to close their eyes to the fact that our Parliamentary institutions are now being tried in a very different manner from that in which they were tried in the days of the Crimean war, and that the results of that trial, so far as they are visible, are anything but satisfactory. This is the central fact in the history of home politics during the past month. If we add to it the unpleasant revelations which have been made during the month with regard to the War Office, and the relations of the Secretary of State and the late Commander-in-Chief, we shall hardly need to take into account the enormous financial burdens which are being heaped upon the nation in order to feel justified in saying that the times are indeed out of joint.

One pleasing and satisfactory feature of the story of the month may be noticed before I turn to the details of our political history. The Duke and Duchess of Cornwall have gone forth upon a mission not unlike that undertaken by the King himself when, as Prince of Wales, he visited India many years ago. They have gone, not as private persons, and not even as the future King and Queen, but as the direct representatives of the Sovereign. The Duke of Cornwall may be said, indeed, to be the representative and envoy, not merely of King Edward, but of the great Queen who in the closing days of her reign appointed him to this task; and we may feel assured that he will be received wherever he goes in this double capacity. It gives a pathetic significance to his mission, and at the same time it demonstrates more forcibly than anything else could do the continuity of the sovereignty of England and of the policy and sentiments of the Throne in its relations with the British people in all parts of the world. The public at home, which showed so lively an interest in the beginning of the Duke's long voyage on the 16th of March, will follow his movements with unabated zest throughout his journey. There is nothing far-fetched in the belief that this historic progress of the Heir-Apparent through the more distant portions of the realm will tend to draw still closer the ties that bind the mother-country and the scattered members which constitute with her the glorious entity of the British Empire.

The question of the revenues to be allotted to the Crown during the present reign has been considered by a Committee of the House of Commons during the month, and it is understood that a decision has been arrived at which meets with general, if not absolutely universal, approval. King Edward and his family will enjoy a somewhat larger revenue than was allotted to Queen Victoria when she came to the Throne. The justice of this increase is so obvious that

it does not require to be defended. The mere change in the value of money since 1837 of itself makes the increase nominal rather than real. It would be intolerable to the British people to see their Sovereign stinted of the means needed to maintain the majesty of the Throne. It would be still more intolerable to them to think of him as pinched by pecuniary embarrassments. No one can pretend that the Committee of the House of Commons will err on the side of extravagance or prodigality. The revenue of the Crown under King Edward will still be smaller than that allotted to English monarchs in days when the country was far poorer than it is now, and smaller than that enjoyed by the sovereigns of Continental States which have no pretensions to the wealth or might of the British Empire.

The proceedings in Parliament during the month have been of singular and varied interest. Although no great party-battles have been fought, and no precise issues have been raised between the Ministerialists and the Opposition, the controversial side of politics has been very conspicuous. Personal questions, for which both Houses of Parliament have that special liking which shows their kinship with common human nature, have played a great part in the proceedings of the month. The most important of these personal questions has, undoubtedly, been the sharp altercation between Lord Wolseley, the late Commander-in-Chief, and Lord Lansdowne, the late Secretary of State for War. Lord Wolseley, in fulfilment of a promise made some time back, directed the attention of the House of Lords to certain features of the position of the Commander-in-Chief since 1895, which seemed to him to be disadvantageous to the public service. His speech was not only, from every point of view, a legitimate expression of opinion, but was couched in terms of singular good-nature. He attacked nobody, he indulged in no malicious innuendoes; his whole object seemed to be to call attention to the drawbacks under which, under existing regulations, the Commander-in-Chief is compelled to labour. To the amazement of all who were present in the House of Lords on the occasion, Lord Lansdowne's reply to this speech took the form of a deliberate and very acrimonious attack upon Lord Wolseley. The late Commander-in-Chief was charged with having given the Secretary for War bad advice regarding the campaign in South Africa, and with having neglected the duties of his high office by his failure to use the powers with which he was entrusted. A more unprovoked and unjustifiable attack upon a public servant by a responsible Minister has seldom, if ever, been made. It is difficult to conceive Lord Lansdowne's motive in taking this course. On the surface it would seem as though the late Secretary for War, bitterly resentful of the criticisms to which he was exposed during the earlier period of the campaign in South Africa, had sought to shuffle out of an unpleasant

position by transferring to the Commander-in-Chief the whole responsibility for the blunders and failures which public opinion has condemned so emphatically. It is, however, difficult to believe that Lord Lansdowne can have been so far forgetful of the best traditions of public life as to seek to shelter himself behind a permanent official for whose actions he has to bear the Parliamentary responsibility. One can only conjecture that during the strain and stress of the worst period of the war many causes of irritation sprang up between the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief, and that, in a moment of petulance, Lord Lansdowne was led to take the House of Lords and the country into his confidence. Be the cause what it may, the result has been the reverse of edifying. Lord Rosebery, in his comments upon the two scenes in the House in which Lord Lansdowne and Lord Wolseley confronted each other as though they stood in hostile camps, justly said that they constituted one of the most painful episodes in recent Parliamentary procedure. That Lord Wolseley may have had his faults as Commander-in-Chief is not to be denied. But Lord Lansdowne and his eager newspaper *claque* seem to have lost sight of one fact—that is, that the greater deficiencies of Lord Wolseley, the graver must be the indictment against Lord Lansdowne himself. He was the supreme head of the War Office. It was he, and not Lord Wolseley, who was responsible to Parliament and the Sovereign for the manner in which the war was conducted. After taking office he had arranged the duties of the new Commander-in-Chief in such a fashion as to augment the authority of the Secretary of State over the holder of what I may call the military premiership. In these circumstances, whatever may have been Lord Wolseley's defects or failures, Lord Lansdowne has clearly not a shadow of right to shield himself from criticism by referring to them. The plain truth seems to be that in the early stages of the war—and let us hope that it was in the early stages only—the War Office fell into a state of muddle, and the Secretary of State showed that he was not strong enough personally to put an end to the muddle or to evolve order and system out of chaos. This 'painful episode,' in fact, has done more to convince the public that a great reform in our system of Army administration is necessary than even the terrible miscalculations and failures of last year did.

Of minor interest was the controversy raised in the House of Commons over the question of General Colville's removal from his post at Gibraltar. General Colville was one of those officers, unfortunately a somewhat numerous body, whose names were associated with disasters to our troops in South Africa. I have no intention of entering into the question of the extent of General Colville's responsibility for our reverses at Sanna's Post and Lindley. There are certain essential points to be cleared up in the narratives

of these events before outsiders can express any definite opinion with regard to them. But undoubtedly the War Office did not shine in its treatment of General Colville's case. To begin with, after a report had been received from Lord Roberts on the subject of General Colville's conduct, and therefore, it may be presumed, after the highest authorities at home had given full consideration to his case, he was permitted to return to his command at Gibraltar. This was when Lord Lansdowne was Secretary of State and Lord Wolseley Commander-in-Chief. Subsequently, when the Ministry had been reconstructed, Mr. Brodrick taking the place of Lord Lansdowne at the War Office, and when Lord Wolseley's term of office as Commander-in-Chief had terminated, a peremptory order was sent to General Colville requiring him to resign his command. No reason was assigned for this curious change of front, nor was General Colville given the opportunity of defending his conduct before a court-martial. He refused to resign, and was forthwith removed from his post. He came to England in the character of a man with a grievance, and the House of Commons has heard his grievance discussed in more than one debate during the past month. Here, again, the War Office has acted in such a manner as to lay itself open to serious animadversion. It may have done the right thing in its treatment of General Colville, but, if so, it has clearly done it in the wrong way. However highly we may esteem the necessity for maintaining military discipline, the feeling in favour of fair play between man and man is a sentiment which most of us hold still more strongly. If we grant everything that is asserted against General Colville, it is still difficult to resist the conclusion that he has been punished for his offences in an unfortunate manner. The War Office authorities veered from one extreme to the other in a fashion which has left a painful impression upon the public mind; while, to make matters still worse, Mr. Chamberlain fell into the deplorable indiscretion of treating the whole question as though it were a simple one of confidence in Lord Roberts. In doing so, he was as unjust to the new Commander-in-Chief as Lord Lansdowne was to his predecessor in that office.

Apart from these personal questions, the interest of the Parliamentary proceedings during the month has centred upon the Army and Navy Estimates, and upon Mr. Brodrick's scheme for the reform of our military system. So far as the Brodrick scheme is concerned, it would be misleading to say that it has been received with enthusiasm by anybody. Possibly my readers may think that it would be equally misleading if I were to assert that it is believed in by nobody. Yet the latter assertion is not so far wide of the mark as at the first glance it may appear to be. Certainly, if rumour may be trusted, among those who regard it with scepticism, its own authors are to be counted. Mr. Brodrick had before him an almost

impossible task. He was called upon by the Cabinet, in obedience to a public demand, to frame a scheme which should furnish a great army that might take the field against the huge forces of the Continent on not unequal terms; and he was at the same time forbidden to look beyond voluntary enlistment for the means of augmenting and recruiting our troops. Cynics declare that the new scheme is one designed to establish one fact, and one only—that is, the impossibility of obtaining a great army by means of voluntary enlistment. The advocates of compulsory military service in one form or another are already crying exultantly, ‘Here is the best thing you can get without conscription or the ballot! You see what a poor thing it is; and the chances are that you cannot even get this by voluntary enlistment. Will you not learn the moral?’ I leave the discussion of this scheme to experts; but this is, unquestionably, the temper in which it has been received in Parliament and the country. It has still to be discussed in the House of Commons, but the mere fact that it should have been produced is an omen of grave significance.

In the meantime, the Estimates for the two services, which have been duly laid before the House of Commons, illustrate both the gravity of the times in which we live and the prevailing tendency of opinion among the governing classes. The Estimates have attained proportions which all must admit to be colossal, and which some describe as appalling. Putting aside the question of war expenditure, which figures for a sum, speaking roundly, of 60 millions, the regular charge for the Army, in the new Estimates, amounts to more than 27 millions. The Navy Estimates attain the still higher net total of 31 millions. Additions for permanent works raise the Estimates for the Army to 31 millions, and for the Navy to 33 millions. We are thus committed to an expenditure upon the two services for the current year of 64 millions, not a penny of this enormous sum being directly due to the war. It is easy to understand the feeling with which economists of the old school regard such figures as these. The outcry against ‘bloated armaments’ was at its loudest when the expenditure upon the Army and Navy was barely one-half of the present amount. To-day we have to face Estimates the like of which have never been seen, never even dreamed of, before. And in what temper do the people of Great Britain contemplate this enormous expenditure, for which they will have to provide from their own pockets? It is a temper, as Mr. Robertson remarked in the House of Commons, of absolute indifference. ‘Bedlam ought to be enlarged’ was the commentary of a great statesman of the past, when he heard that the House of Commons and the Liberal party had agreed to Naval Estimates which were smaller by some 14 millions than those of to-day. That was an explosion of the old feeling of passionate resentment against

increased expenditure upon our national armaments. One wonders what Mr. Cobden or Mr. Gladstone would have had to say about these Estimates. But one wonders still more at the fact that hardly a voice is heard in protest from politicians or publicists of any party. The country is certainly not so much richer than it was seven years ago that it can regard with equanimity the vast additions to the national burdens which have been made since then. The increase in the Army Estimates is, however, accepted almost without a murmur as the natural consequence of the exposure of our defective military system which has been brought home to us by the war. As to the Navy Estimates, the country is practically unanimous in its determination that, come what come may, the fleet shall be strong enough to hold its own against any probable combination of adverse Powers. Nothing has been more remarkable in the history of the past month than the extraordinary calmness, one might almost call it apathy, with which these unparalleled Estimates have been received. Is it indeed the case that, having put our hands to the plough, we are resolved on no account to look back? or are we merely moving under the pressure of a blind impulse which will not survive the coming Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

Upon one point the House of Commons seems happily to be inspired by a wholesome spirit. It is anxious that the nation should receive full value for its immense expenditure. The brief debates upon the Navy Estimates proved that no one was inclined to take upon himself the responsibility of refusing the supplies asked for, but that on both sides of the House men were anxious to satisfy themselves that the money was to be well spent. It is still a puzzle to most of us how the work of increasing the fleet has been allowed to fall behind during the last four years. Mr. Arnold-Forster (whose appearance as an actual administrator instead of a critic has been hailed on all sides with satisfaction) attributes the failure to carry out the programme of successive years to the great struggle in the engineering trade. It may be so; but it is difficult to understand how a disturbance of industrial conditions which only lasted for a few weeks can have affected the progress of our manufactures for a term of several years. Fortunately, the cause, whatever it may be, now seems to have been removed, and we may at least hope that the great shipbuilding programme of the current year will be duly accomplished. On two points connected with the past policy of the Admiralty somewhat disquieting announcements have been made. The first of these points is the condition of the naval works at Gibraltar. Certain amateurs, among whom Mr. Gibson Bowles occupies a prominent place, have come to the conclusion that a fatal mistake has been made in placing the new docks on the west side of the Rock, where they may be exposed to the fire of batteries on the Spanish mainland.

Their contention is that the east side should have been chosen, and they have induced the Government to consent to the appointment of a small committee to report upon the subject. It seems rather late in the day to re-open the question of the site of works which are now approaching completion, and upon which a very large sum of money has already been expended. The present site was chosen after long deliberation and the most exhaustive investigations on the spot by officers of authority and eminence. It is more than probable that the new inquiry will simply confirm the decision arrived at by the Board of 1894. But the British public have a sentimental affection for the wonderfully picturesque fortress which seems to guard the entrance to the Mediterranean that makes them extremely sensitive to any question affecting its security, and we shall probably see a battle raged over the Gibraltar docks akin to that which has been carried on over the Belleville boilers. It is the efficiency of these boilers which furnishes the second point in regard to naval policy about which some uneasiness has been shown. The Secretary to the Admiralty has announced that in consequence of a report from a committee of experts the adoption of the Belleville boilers in new ships is to be abandoned; they are, however, to be retained in the ships already afloat or under construction. The intimation is undoubtedly disquieting, but there appears to be no reason for the panic into which some critics of naval matters seem to have fallen. The fact that the Belleville boilers are employed in the French Navy and that they were unquestionably the best type of water-tube boilers existing at the time of their adoption by our own Admiralty, should satisfy us that, even though they may now be superseded by improved types, no mistake was made when they were originally selected. One other matter connected with the Naval Estimates must not be allowed to pass without mention. After long deliberation the Admiralty have at last resolved to add to our fleet a certain number of those submarine vessels regarding the possible usefulness of which so wide a diversity of opinion prevails. In taking this step the Government have unquestionably yielded to the pressure of public opinion. The submarine boat may only be in the experimental stage; but the experiment is one which the British Navy cannot afford to leave untried.

With the exception of certain rather remarkable attempts at temperance legislation which have been made in both Houses of Parliament during the month, there is little in the other proceedings of the Legislature to call for notice, except those which have reference to the grave subject I have already mentioned—the decline in the popularity and influence of the House of Commons. The action of certain of the Irish members on the 5th of March in refusing to leave the House when a division had been called, led to one of the most lamentable scenes ever witnessed in Parliament. The members in

question, although repeatedly ordered by the Speaker to retire to the division lobbies, refused to do so. As a consequence, a body of police was brought into the House and the disobedient members expelled by force. The spectacle of policemen invading the sacred floor of Parliament and ejecting the representatives of the people in the fashion in which drunken men are expelled from public-houses is one that might well cause a shudder of horror and indignation to any Parliamentarian of the old school. But even this deplorable incident does not seem to have caused any deep emotion in the public mind. This, no doubt, may be attributed in part to the offensive folly of the members who provoked the scene. New, for the most part, to the House of Commons, and eager to prove that they looked upon themselves as aliens in a hostile Parliament, they had no regard for those traditions to which very few even of Irish agitators have in the past been wholly indifferent. They were reckless in provoking the fate which overtook them, and, so far as they themselves were concerned, the verdict of the public was one of 'served them right.' But it is impossible to recall this shameful episode in the history of the House of Commons without a feeling of deep disquietude. That 'the mighty mother of free Parliaments' should have been placed, under any circumstances, at the mercy of a posse of constables, is indeed one of the most painful incidents in its story. That both members themselves and the country at large should have accepted the incident almost as a matter of course, shows how great is, for the moment, the decline in popularity and influence of a Representative Chamber which was once regarded by the whole civilised world with unfeigned reverence. Nor is it to the action of the Irish members only that this decline is to be attributed. Parliament is always strong enough to guard its dignity and its authority against the encroachments of an isolated band of agitators, and though fresh repressive measures against mere obstruction are always to be regretted, when they are clearly called for, as in the present case, the House does not hesitate to adopt them.

But the steady and swift decline in the influence of the Representative Chamber is due to more insidious and deadly causes than the turbulent obstructiveness of a few members from Ireland. Many men on both sides of the House openly attribute this decline to errors in its leadership. Mr. Balfour has many admirable qualities, and no one will dispute his right to be considered one of the foremost personalities in our public life. But from causes which are not so clearly apparent to outside observers as they must be to his fellow-members in the House of Commons, he is certainly not so fortunate as many men of greatly inferior talent have been in his attempts to lead that House. Slight lapses of memory, a momentary neglect of some old usage, temporary absence from the Treasury bench at a time when the leader ought to have been there, a neglect of ordinary

business habits, these seem to be the chief causes of his lack of success in managing the Chamber and of the consequent irritation which is felt by the members, not on the Opposition benches only. Nobody imputes to him any deliberate intention to neglect the House of Commons or to show any want of respect to it. But from time to time he undoubtedly succeeds in impressing upon the members the feeling that, somehow or other, they are not treated as they ought to be and as they have been treated in times past. If, however, the members generally acquit Mr. Balfour of any intentional disregard for their accustomed privileges, many of them do not conceal their belief that in another quarter they are being treated with open indifference. Lord Salisbury cannot complain if this is the belief of a great number of members of Parliament, including not a few who are the supporters of his own Administration. He has never taken the trouble to dissimulate when speaking of the House of Commons. It may be quite true that he is equally cynical in his attitude towards the House of Lords; but that is a different matter. A peer speaking among his peers may say what he likes about his own House; a peer who is also the head of the Government cannot be equally outspoken regarding the House of Commons without creating a very angry feeling in the latter place.

WEMYSS REID.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER



No. CCXCI—MAY 1901

THE COSTS OF THE WAR

ALTHOUGH the labours and the anxieties of Great Britain in South Africa still continue, there are everywhere signs of the gradual approach of the end of the war. De Wet's disastrous failure in the late invasion of the Cape Colony—General French's successes in the eastern districts of the Transvaal—the occupation of Pietersburg by Colonel Plumer's forces—the loss of nearly the whole of the Boer artillery—the increasing scarcity of small-arms ammunition—the almost daily surrender of Boers who have been on commando—are so many proofs that the means of resistance are nearly exhausted, and that the desperate struggle is nearing its close.

When the task of the Imperial forces is accomplished, and not until then, the difficulties of reconstruction will be fully realised. Questions political, social, financial, will then demand immediate solution, both at home and in South Africa.

In South Africa, How and by what means, can nearly twenty

thousand Boer prisoners of war be restored to their homes consistently with public safety, and without risk to the new order of things?

At home, the first question will be, How, and by whom, and in what proportions, are the costs of the war to be defrayed? This latter question is of first-rate importance to the British taxpayer. The military bill for the war has already, as every one knows, attained formidable dimensions, and is still growing at the rate of more than 1,000,000*l.* a week. In addition to the direct military expenditure, indirect local claims for damages will have to be dealt with: such as the claims of Natal colonists for losses arising from the Boer invasion of the colony in October 1899; the claims of Cape Colonists for damage sustained in the early part of the war, and also in the later incursions by De Wet and by other Boer commandoes. It may also be necessary to pay regard to the complaints of Uitlanders resident in the two late republics, who were plundered and ruined by their Boer neighbours on account of their British sympathies.

Last, though not least, it appears from official information that a loan amounting to 1,000,000*l.* may be made to the inhabitants of the two late republics, including even Boers who have been fighting during the war, to enable them to restock their farms and to make a fresh start under the new Administration. Can history furnish an instance of such extreme generosity on the part of a victorious nation—in the face, too, of unparalleled provocation, and in view of a probability amounting almost to certainty that this action of the British Government will, like all its previous actions, be misinterpreted and misunderstood by the Boers, either through that ‘slimness’ which disgraces an otherwise sterling character, or through impenetrable stupidity and ignorance?

What is quite certain is that the direct and indirect expenses of the war will amount to nearly 100,000,000*l.* or perhaps to even a larger sum.

It will be necessary to submit to very close examination the claims for damages which may be put forward in South Africa, and also to consider carefully the respective liability of different colonial Governments.

The Colony of Natal has displayed firm loyalty and courage, has assisted in its own defence, and, if we leave out of consideration the not unnatural terror of the Government at the outbreak of the war which influenced and hampered the disposition of the British forces, has deserved well of the Empire.

The Cape Colony appears in a rather different light. Any damages suffered in the early part of the war can be shown to be directly attributable to the action and to the inaction of the colonial executive and legislature. Not only did the Cape Ministers refuse up to the last moment to believe in any hostile intention on the part

of the Boer Republics, not only did they permit warlike stores, guns, and ammunition to pass without hindrance into the Orange Free State, but they declined to allow the local authorities at Kimberley to import arms or to prepare otherwise for self-defence. If Kimberley had been captured, "if the Cape Colony had been occupied by the Boers, the Government of the Cape Colony would have been wholly and solely to blame.

A colony which receives the privilege of self-government accepts at the same time the responsibility for self-defence; and if, owing to the neglect of the colonial Government, a colony suffers damage, the colony must look for reparation to itself and to itself alone. Although subsequent events have shown that Mr. Schreiner, and some at all events of his colleagues, were deceived by the declarations and protests of President Steyn and President Kruger, this does not absolve them nor the Cape Colony from the consequences of their neglect of duty.

With regard to the losses occasioned by Boer incursions later in the war, the case may possibly be different. A considerable part of the colony had been placed under martial law, and it may with some reason be argued that the Imperial forces had assumed the duty of defending the country. Even, however, in this case it is to be hoped that strict inquiry will be made, and that no compensation will be given from any Imperial source to those who either directly or indirectly aided, abetted, or showed favour to the enemy. It is notorious that disaffection was general in the north-eastern districts of the colony; and it is politic, as well as just, that the disloyal (who, moreover, had no excuse whatever for their disloyalty) should feel the disagreeable realities of being invaded and looted by their friends.

The first set-off against the expenses of the war will be the assets belonging to the Governments of the late Republics. Of these perhaps the most important are the profits derived from the State-owned and other railways.

The railways of the Orange Free State, being State railways, have lapsed by conquest to Great Britain. They were originally constructed and worked by the Cape Colony under an agreement; but a few years ago the Orange Free State determined, in an unfortunate moment for itself, to repay to the Cape Colony the capital cost of construction, a sum of 2,700,000*l.*, and to take over the working of the lines. The public accounts show that in 1896 a net profit of over 500,000*l.* was thus obtained, and in 1897 a profit of 408,000*l.*

The Netherlands Railway, the principal railway in the Transvaal, stands on a rather peculiar footing. Although it belongs ostensibly to a private company with a capital of 1,166,666*l.*, shares to the amount of 476,000*l.* belonged to the Transvaal Government, which

also received 85 per cent. of the profits after a fixed dividend of 6 per cent. had been paid to the shareholders. The profits received by the State, according to the official returns, amounted in 1897 to 737,000*l.*, a sum sufficient to pay interest of 3 per cent. on a capital of nearly 25,000,000*l.* This Government interest in the railway has, of course, passed to Great Britain.

It appears, however, from the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Transvaal Concessions, that the railway company, whose line was, under their charter, liable to be taken over by the Government in the event of public necessity, saw fit to exceed their contract, and to become an active belligerent, by coming to the assistance of the republics with every means at their disposal. The evidence proving this allegation has already been published in the newspapers, and will, doubtless, appear at length in the report of the Royal Commission, which is awaited with much interest. It is sufficient to reproduce here an extract from the letter of the managing director, M. Van Kretschmar, addressed to the Board on the 28th of April, 1900.

If it should come to the worst and the English become masters here, I am afraid we have hopelessly compromised ourselves in deed, word, and writing. We have made cannon and ammunition, sold material to the Republics, and blown up bridges in English territory. We have not discharged our staff while absent on commando; we have assisted the Free State with *personnel* and *matériel*. There are in existence letters and telegrams which are living witnesses that we strongly supported the Government defence. . . .

It appears from other letters of M. Van Kretschmar that the Board, in the early part of the war, approved of the active part taken, and even asked for a report of gallant actions performed by their officials, for insertion in the annual report. In the spring, however, of 1900 the Board in Holland changed their minds in view of the altered circumstances, and began to enjoin the observance of neutrality; when they were reminded by their managing Director of their previous attitude, and informed that it was now too late to pretend to be neutral.

The Netherlands Railway Company, having thus chosen actively to war against Great Britain, have rendered their whole property in South Africa liable to forfeiture; and even were this not so, it is clear that the British Government may levy a ^{very} indemnity which it chooses, in respect of the damage done.

In what position the debenture holders may stand it is difficult to judge until the report of the Royal Commission is published. It matters not who the shareholders may be, or to what nationality they belong. They are bound by the action of their Board and of their officials. They have richly deserved the punishment which awaits them; and it will be strange indeed if the British Government should hesitate to exact the full penalty of total confiscation.

Assuming that Great Britain will take possession of the railways in the new colonies, there is an overwhelming preponderance of argument in favour of her retaining in her own hands, as the Imperial Power, the working of the lines. Apart altogether from the superiority of a British board of management, it is evident that the control of the railways will be the most potent means of preventing any future rising. Those who superintend the working of the railways possess unequalled opportunities of observing what is passing in the country, and of obtaining information. It will be impossible, too, to introduce guns and ammunition as pianos when there are no longer friendly officials to assist in the fraud. Moreover, the great body of railway servants, being in the service of Great Britain, would have the strongest inducement to loyalty, and would be able to render valuable assistance in any emergency.

It is to be hoped that the British Government will never relinquish the management of the railways, even after the new colonies have received representative institutions. What has recently happened in the Cape Colony is a warning and an example of what might occur in the new colonies in the event of a Dutch majority in the legislature. It cannot be forgotten that the Dutch Cabinet had been steadily dismissing railway officials and servants of British origin, in order to substitute men of Afrikaner origin and sympathies. It cannot be forgotten that grave exception was taken in the Cape Parliament to the use of the railways by the Imperial forces, even although parts of the Cape Colony had been invaded.

The necessity of harmonious co-operation and agreement in regard to railway tariffs and facilities throughout South Africa is another strong reason why Great Britain should retain railway control in the new colonies. The quarrels and disputes of the late Transvaal Government with the Cape Colony and with Natal about railway communication were endless, and, at least on one occasion, very nearly developed into war. The rapidly growing railways of Rhodesia will soon become an important factor in the problem of the future South African railway system. A little consideration of the problem will show that the British Government, being impartial and free from local jealousies, is in a position eminently favourable for exercising a beneficial influence upon the railway destinies of South Africa.

One practical argument, however, outweighs all other arguments, viz. the fact that Great Britain has recently been reminded by the Dutch party in the Cape Colony that her predominance in South Africa must be maintained by her own right hand. Political equality—full and complete freedom of every kind—have not been able to overcome in the Dutch mind the desire to substitute Dutch for British sovereignty. The aim of British statesmen must be to render the fulfilment of that desire more and more impossible; and, after late

experience, it seems almost incredible that Great Britain should part with the control of the railways which give access to the central portions of Africa, and which, in unfriendly hands, might again be used against her.

Whether, under British management, the net profits of the railways would—at first, at all events—be maintained at the figures reached under the late Transvaal Government by the aid of exorbitant tariffs and by the concession of a virtual monopoly to the Netherlands Railway, may reasonably be doubted. On the other hand it is not improbable that under an improved system of management and a policy of judicious extensions these profits may in course of time even be increased.

At the present moment, in the apportionment of the costs of the war, the value of the railways might, not unfairly, be taken at their present amount, viz. between 1,100,000*l.* and 1,200,000*l.* per annum, which would be equivalent to the interest on, say, 40,000,000*l.* From this sum there would fall to be deducted whatever payment, if any, is found to be due to the debenture holders.

Besides the railways there are other valuable assets belonging to the late Republics to which Great Britain will succeed, and which must be taken into account. * Amongst these are the Bewaarplatzen; all the land remaining to the State, including the undeveloped mines, and mining rights; and also all the farms whose owners have disappeared during the war.

After deducting the value of the above mentioned and of any other public assets, the next task will be to apportion the remaining cost between Great Britain and the new colonies.

A strong effort will be made—and in a certain portion of the South African Press is already being made—to impose the whole liability upon the British taxpayer..

It is argued that it would be unwise to impose taxes on a colony; and the result of the taxation by Great Britain of her American colonies is cited as a warning. It is pointed out that for some years the new Colonies will be unable to do more than meet the heavy cost of the police and military forces which will be required for their safety.

Those who adopt these arguments omit altogether essential points in the case which do not lead to the conclusion at which they desire to arrive. They argue as if they are a self-governing British Colony—and as if the present war had not been undertaken at all on their account. They omit to remember that what led to the war was the refusal of the Transvaal Government to remedy or alleviate the unjust treatment of the Uitlanders, including themselves. They omit to remember that at this moment they are not self-governing British colonists, but persons residing or owning property in territory lately annexed by Great Britain, part of which is as yet under

military rule. They omit to remember that but for the war there would have been no question of a British colony at all.

When representative institutions are offered to the new colonies, the terms will be fixed on which self-government will be conceded, but which it will not be necessary to accept. On undertaking self-government, these Colonies will be started on unprecedentedly favourable terms, being from the commencement in possession of ample revenues, with a territory in course of rapid development, and with towns already built and enjoying municipal government. The value of all property is being greatly enhanced and the future expansion and prosperity of the country are secured by the hoisting of the British flag. Why, then, is it unjust to impose upon these Colonies their fair share of the costs of the war by means of which alone they will have been brought into existence? The case of the American Colonies is not in any way analogous. Great Britain endeavoured to impose upon them customs duties for her benefit, and not for theirs. They had been left to work out for themselves their own development.

It may be conceded, for the sake of argument, that the new Colonies may at first be unable to meet their portion of the charge for the war debt. Is that any reason why, for all time to come, they should be exempted from all payment? Under a wise system of taxation and administration, aided by the rapid development of the country, the Colonial revenue is certain to expand. If the portion of the debt falling to the new Colonies be guaranteed by Great Britain, no long time will elapse before they will be able to meet the interest and arrears, whether they are under the government of the Crown or whether they govern themselves. Even if the event were to turn out otherwise, and if it should ultimately become necessary for Great Britain to assume the whole of the burden, it would be none the less unjust and inexpedient at the present moment to impose it upon Great Britain alone.

CAMPERDOWN.

THE RECENT ANGLO-ROMAN PASTORAL

THE English Episcopate has recently addressed a joint pastoral to the clergy and laity of the Church of England, insisting on the duty of obedience to episcopal pronouncements. The bishops of the Roman obedience in England have also addressed a pastoral to their flocks on the same subject.

Both pastorals raise issues of great importance, and both seem not unlikely to have results very different from those which their respective authors probably intended.

The pastoral published by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and their suffragans, though more immediately concerned with the question of obedience to the recent opinions put out by the Archbishops in regard to the ceremonial use of incense and the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, raises questions of much greater importance than those which attach to any mere detail of ritual considered in itself, or even to such a matter as Reservation of the Holy Sacrament for the use of the sick and dying. A bishop might for particular reasons, or in a particular case, forbid the ceremonial use of incense, or the Reservation of the Holy Sacrament, and the Church be none the worse. It is not so, however, with questions touching the claims and authority of the Church herself. The nature of episcopal authority, the sanctions to which it must of necessity appeal, the methods of its exercise, and the principles which it postulates in order to justify its claims to obedience; are some of the questions raised by the pastoral of the English bishops. Other questions of no less importance are also involved in it. Has a national Church the right to separate itself in regard to doctrine and practice from the accepted teaching and usage of the rest of the Catholic Church of which it professes to be a part? To give an instance: in view of the teaching and practice of the Church, East and West alike, has any national Church the right to forbid the use of the 'Hail Mary,' or 'the Invocation of Saints,' in the sense of asking for their prayers?

Again, what is the extent of the obligation which may be supposed to attach to particular changes in regard to doctrine and

practice actually made by the authorities of a national Church, especially if forced upon a local Church under the very exceptional circumstances which in the sixteenth century and since have determined the history and character of the Church of England?

These are all questions involved in the recent pastoral of the English Episcopate and the opinions of the Archbishops for which it claims obedience. Having been raised, these questions must be faced, and if they are honestly faced, the result can hardly fail not only largely to affect the character and shift the ground of existing religious controversies in England, but to exercise an important influence on the future of Christendom at large.

It is, however, foreign to the purpose of this article to discuss the pastoral of the English bishops. That has recently been done with very great completeness by Canon MacColl in the new edition of his book on the Reformation Settlement, and by the Rev. W. J. Scott in an article on 'The Crisis in the Church, from an Extreme Point of View,' published in the April number of this Review. The object of the present article is to draw attention to the joint pastoral recently issued by Cardinal Vaughan and the Roman Catholic Episcopate in England, to the nature and extent of the authority claimed by that pastoral for the rulers of the Church, and to the grounds on which it demands assent, exterior and interior, to the utterances of ecclesiastical authority.

Such a discussion may not be without its bearing upon existing controversies within the limits of the Church of England. It may indirectly suggest reflections, and help to clear up difficulties as to the nature and extent of ecclesiastical authority, and as to the methods by which such authority should be exercised amongst ourselves; and, more remotely, like the raising of the questions provoked by the pastoral of the Anglican bishops, it may be at least a step towards indicating some of the obstacles which at present hinder that reunion of Christendom so imperatively demanded by the needs of the Church of Christ.

If an excuse is wanted for one outside the Roman Communion attempting such a discussion, it is to be found, first, in the fact that the questions raised by the pastoral of the Roman Catholic Episcopate in England affect not merely the Roman Communion, but the whole Church; and, secondly, in the conviction that the authors of the pastoral were not entirely uninfluenced, so far, at least, as portions of the pastoral are concerned, by a consideration of the existing controversies and present circumstances of the Church of England. Be this as it may, in the eyes of those who believe that Christ has entrusted to His apostles and their successors authority to feed and govern His Church, the unhappy schisms which divide Christendom, and have driven the members of the Episcopate in England into two rival camps, cannot divest the utterances of any portion of the one

Episcopate of that right to a respectful attention which is due from all who recognise the sacred character of the episcopal office.

The pastoral of the Anglo-Roman bishops begins with the statement that 'for 300 years no religious tribunal capable of teaching with unerring certainty, or of binding the conscience in the name of God, has been recognised by the English people.' 'The result has been to substitute the principle of private judgment for the principle of obedience to religious authority.'

Those who are known as 'Liberal Catholics' are then unsparringly condemned. 'They take leave to discuss theology and the government of the Church with the same freedom of speech and opinion' as they do other matters. 'They are wanting in filial docility and reverence,' and 'the rights and liberties of the Church have to be defended against them.'

The pastoral next asserts 'the presence and authority of a Divine Teacher' . . . 'on earth,' and declares that 'God Himself is the Divine Teacher of whom we speak.' It then lays down the relations of the *Ecclesia discens* to the *Ecclesia docens*, and, contrasting the spirit of the 'Liberal Catholic,' 'which strips itself of all the instincts of faith and obedience,' with that of 'the docile disciple of Christ,' which 'in all matters of faith, whether positively defined or only felt to be the general mind or approved sentiment of the Church, reposes trustfully in the care and guidance of the Divine Teacher,' goes on to point out to the clergy 'the absolute necessity of thoroughly instructing converts on the ground and motive of faith before receiving them into the Church. Unless they believe that they have found in the Catholic Church the Divine Teacher, they must not be admitted into her pale, no matter how many articles of the Catholic faith they may assent to.' The warning is to be commended for its honesty and straightforwardness, and hints not obscurely at the fact that proselytising zeal in the past has not been always accompanied by discretion, but that the desire to increase the roll of 'Rome's recruits' has, at least in certain cases, led to conversions in haste that have been repented at leisure.

The rest of the pastoral deals with the theory of development, points out how much the teaching-office of the Church is needed to meet present dangers, insists that any attempt to minimise in the sphere of received doctrine and practice is to be condemned, defends the action of the Roman Congregations—as, for example, the Congregation of the Index—and winds up with an appeal to the loyalty of Catholics very similar to the concluding paragraphs of the pastoral put out by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the English Episcopate, which speak of those 'who are regardless of our authority,' and 'exhort them to return to that obedience which alone can expect the blessing of God.'

At a time, therefore, when Leo the Thirteenth is stretching out

his hands to 'those who are wandering far away from the fold of Christ,' and inviting them frankly to 'retrace their steps one and all,' it is only to meet the spirit of the joint pastoral half way if those to whom more especially the Pope's invitation seems to be addressed should ask a few plain questions, lest they too should come under the same condemnation as those too hastily welcomed proselytes of whom there is complaint. Let us know clearly, such persons might say, to what conception of authority we are asked to give our adhesion, that we may look before we leap.

It is, of course, the somewhat chaotic state of Church government amongst ourselves that turns the eyes of the more impatient and fearful towards the contrasted organisation of the Roman Church, and makes them hanker for peace at any price. But 'peace at any price' is an intolerable principle of conduct, and therefore such persons have a right to know more exactly at what price this peace is to be purchased, and whether in flying from the ills they know to those they know not they may not be exchanging temporary and possibly remediable anarchy, if anarchy it be, for permanent and irremediable absolutism. Following roughly the divisions of the pastoral, there are at least two points on which such persons might desiderate far clearer and more definite answers than have hitherto been accorded to them, or can be gathered inferentially from the document before them. They are the precise limits, first, of the infallible teaching-authority claimed for the Pope; then, of the non-infallible teachings of the Pope, bishops, congregations, and other components of the *Ecclesia docens*. It is not the fact of authority that is obscure, but its nature and limits. For the inspired words quoted by the bishops in defence of ecclesiastical, papal, and episcopal authority indifferently must be taken either absolutely *au pied de la lettre*, or else with limits. If with limits, they are uninformative until we know exactly what those limits are; but such limitation is not very clearly suggested by the language of the pastoral. Yet it is impossible to suppose that the words 'He that heareth you heareth Me,' 'As the Father hath sent Me, so send I you,' 'All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth; go ye, therefore'—it is impossible to suppose that these words are to be applied absolutely and without limit, either to the bishops, or to the Pope, or to both collectively. Christ, as man, possessed complete lordship over the powers of nature; he was, moreover, King of kings and Lord of lords, the source of all temporal sovereignty; he was a revealer of new truths, an institutor of divine mysteries and sacraments. Now, no Roman theologian claims such powers for the Pope or the episcopate as these. Hence we may assume as granted that Christ delegated to his Church, not all, but only some of His powers and offices; that the vicarious office of Pope or bishop is limited in many ways. In what ways? is the whole question. We look, however, in vain for any hint of limitation in

such a passage as this, 'Now God Himself is the Divine Teacher of whom we speak. When our Lord Jesus Christ was upon earth, God spoke through the lips of His Sacred Humanity. After He had ascended into Heaven, the Divine Teacher spoke through the mouth of Peter and the Apostles, and He now teaches and will continue to teach through their legitimate successors until the consummation of the world.' It is impossible not to infer from this that God speaks through the mouth of the Pope, just as He spoke through the mouth of Christ, which, of course, would mean that the Pope, like Christ or St. Peter, was a source of revelation—that he was not merely infallibly assisted, but simply inspired. Consistently with this false transition from one sense to another, the Church is spoken of throughout as 'the Divine Teacher'; in fact, we are told that 'God Himself is the Divine Teacher now on earth of whom we speak.' The implied argument is that the Pope is Peter, Peter is Christ, Christ is God; therefore the Pope or the Church is God. Now the Church is not God; she is at most a 'divinely assisted' teacher, not a 'Divine Teacher' in the sense of the passage just quoted, which is meant to prove that God has guaranteed to mankind 'the presence and authority of a Divine Teacher who shall remain on earth until the end of time.' This is true within limits; but, again, what are those limits?

Similarly we read, 'That Divine Teacher claims unreserved allegiance, love and obedience, whether He speaks through the Sacred Humanity, or through the Vicar of Christ and the Bishops, who are the successors of the Apostles and "ambassadors for Christ." Before their death the Apostles handed on their ministry to others,' &c.

Is there, then, no difference at all? Is the Church really better off now than when she had but one Christ in her midst and only twelve Apostles? Surely some tempering of a proposition is required here which if taken absolutely is plainly false, and if taken with limits means nothing till it is stated what those limits are.¹

Whatever other texts may legitimately be extended in their reference from the Apostles to the Church of the subsequent ages, those at least cannot which bear upon their unique and intransmissible office of eyewitnesses and firsthand hearers of the deeds and words of Christ. Yet the pastoral quotes such texts as throwing light upon the authority of the living Church of to-day: 'Ye shall give testimony, *because ye are with me from the beginning*'; 'He shall teach you all things, and *bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I have said unto you.*' The italicised words are sense-

¹ Cf. the statement in the pastoral, 'One and the same is the Lord and Teacher who gave the Ten Commandments to Moses on Mount Sinai and who now instructs and rules the hierarchy of the Church.' And in the same way? Else what force has this statement?

less except in reference to the Twelve; nor do Roman theologians pretend that the Holy Ghost *teaches* the Church in the sense in which He taught the Apostles, namely, by way of revelation.

In short the exegetical portion of the pastoral either proves a great deal too much, even from a Roman point of view, or else it proves only what no one questioned: namely, that the Pope and the other bishops, like the lowliest parish priest or curate, are in *some measure* the vicegerents of Christ, as also are all kings and rulers and Governments and parents and superiors and masters.

Here, therefore, we get no light. In the later portion of the pastoral, however, distinctions are drawn between what is *de fide divina* and what is *de fide ecclesiastica*; and then between infallible and fallible teaching-authority; but in all these points the clearness is apparent and superficial, the obscurity deep-seated and well-nigh impenetrable. When we try to seize hold of these conceptions, they crumble to pieces in our grasp, and leave us with a handful of dust and confusion.

To deal first with the limits claimed for papal infallibility; for it is all a question of limits: an authority whose limits are unknown is as good as non-existent.

We take for granted that 'assistance' differs from inspiration and revelation in that the two latter are more or less miraculous, and work their effects by a departure from the ordinary laws which govern the human mind in its pursuit of truth; whereas 'assistance' means only a special Providence guiding the use of natural means to the end desired, whether fallibly or infallibly, and therefore excludes anything of the nature of a miraculous enlightenment of the mind so guided. If it means more than this, then it is one of those points upon which intending 'converts' need to be more carefully instructed.

We understand, then, that the Pope and the bishops singly are not 'inspired,' but 'assisted'; the former infallibly under certain conditions, the latter fallibly. As to that body which the pastoral so often speaks of as 'the bishops united to the Pope,' we may leave it out of account, since the bishops as 'co-definers' only add a certain pomp and solemnity to the papal definitions, but in nowise affect their validity one way or the other according to Roman theology. They are but as the assistants at High Mass, who contribute in no way to the essence of the Sacrifice or Sacrament. Neither the Pope, then, nor any other bishop is inspired, or can add anything to the body of Christ's original revelation; nor can they, at least *ex officio*, claim prophetic insight or dispensation from the ordinary means of acquiring knowledge—assistance being, as stated above, a special Providence guiding the use of ordinary means. Neither general nor special Providence trenches on the natural order of things, or

dispenses men from 'keeping their powder dry.' Two conditions, therefore, are required for an authoritative decision—the use of natural means and a special Providence directing that use. If the former condition be absent the latter is simply impossible.

A volume recently published by a non-Roman Catholic, which has been patronised a good deal by members of the Roman Church, and taken far more seriously than the sceptical author ever intended, lays stress on the fact that the decision of the Vatican Council touching papal infallibility was but a closer and more precise conception of what all along had been implied by the doctrine of ecclesiastical infallibility; that as casuistry and speculation had gradually reduced the consecratory power of the Eucharistic prayer to what are now known as 'the words of consecration,' so a similar casuistry has found the kernel or essence of an (Ecumenical Council to consist in the presence of the Bishop of Rome.

Hence, as the words of consecration suffice absolutely for the validity of the Mass, so the Pope alone, without his traditional *entourage*, of the united Episcopate, suffices for the validity of an œcumenical decision. Whether this be so or not it is not necessary now to inquire. It will be admitted that were it so as a fact, this would be but a development, a closer precision of what was held from the beginning. But the consequences of such an admission fall very far short of the views now current among Roman theologians, and implied in every line of the pastoral before us.

For in this restricted view the Pope but inherits the infallibility formerly ascribed to those rare and epoch-making events known as (Ecumenical Councils. The object of such assemblies, as history testifies, was the preservation of the threatened unity of Christendom. The Council was a desperate and final remedy—a last resort when every other natural and fallible means had been tried and had failed. Had there not been such a final court of appeal, whose decisions could be viewed as practically and really infallible, unity of faith and profession could not have been secured, and as *Natura non deficit in necessariis*, so it was deemed that Christ could not fail His Church in analogous extremities; the gates of Hell might prevail for a time, but not for ever—in a certain locality, but not everywhere, or œcumenically—'Securus judicat orbis terrarum.'

Short of such critical extremities, questions were threshed out by means of those faculties which God gave men to be used, assisted no doubt by the intervention of ordinary and fallible teaching-authority; nor was it imagined for a moment that infallible and divinely assisted guidance could be secured for all the petty details of local and occasional controversy, which God had wisely left to the disputation of men.

And, indeed, it may be asked, Is it so very desirable as it seems at first blush that the Church should be infallibly assisted in every

daily detail of her teaching? Is it not part of God's general method to let us form and make ourselves through struggling and suffering, to reach light through darkness, rest through labour, the crown through the Cross? He helps us, no doubt, in all really necessary matters where we cannot help ourselves. But is it always wise or kind to help men where they *can* help themselves, or where the very conflict is more profitable than victory? And so, of the Church collectively, is it not more for her dignity, her profit, her merit, that she should be left alone, save in cases of extreme need; that infallible guidance should be a last remedy for desperate cases, not a weakening luxury for hourly use? When we subtract the claims of impertinent theological curiosity, for which Christ never intended to provide; when we bring the matter to the great test of 'eternal life,' can it be said that outside the substantial teachings and instructions of Christ there are many matters about which infallible certainty is in any sense a spiritual necessity? Has the metaphysics of transubstantiation ever lifted a heart nearer to God for a single moment? And so of a thousand matters about which religious curiosity is uncertain, but which have no conceivable bearing on the end for which faith and revelation are given us.

If, then, the Pope simply inherits the infallibility of the Ecumenical Council, he will be infallible only in like conditions—namely, as an ultimate principle of unity, as a *last resort*, a court of final appeal when every other ordinary means has been tried in vain; not, therefore, when, anticipating such extremities, he comes forward voluntarily to intervene and cut short controversies which in no sense can yet be said to threaten the unity of Christendom; not when with patriarchal or episcopal authority he gives his opinion as chief among his 'venerable brethren.' This, perhaps, is all that is implied by the *letter* of the Vatican Council; but the spirit of those who pushed the definition through, and who have subsequently developed it in the schools of Rome, is very different. These are governed by the same simple principles of exegesis which are exemplified in the earlier pages of the pastoral. Their line of argument is always the same. Christ bequeathed to His Church whatsoever was needed for the pastoral office when He, the Supreme Shepherd, said to Peter, 'Be Shepherd over my sheep.' The range of the Church's authority, according to the pastoral, 'comprises all that is necessary for the feeding, teaching, and governing the flock.'

But this, that, or the other is easily shown to be needful or desirable for that end; therefore the Church possesses the needful power. Here again we have the notion of an unqualified viceregency, and no hint that the pastoral powers of Peter, still more of the post-Apostolic Church, of the Pope and of the bishops, must be altogether of a lower order than those of Christ. 'Needful' admits of great latitude of interpretation. It might be said that infallible guidance

as to the substance of the Christian faith and the divinely established means of grace—in fact, as to just what Christ revealed and established—is all that is ‘needful’ for the fullest sanctification and salvation; and that for the rest we have no right to expect supernatural intervention, but should trust to those laws and methods whereby men fight their own way upwards. But the now popular notion of the Church’s ‘daily magisterium’ implies that in every matter in anywise concerning religion, whether matters of belief or of devotion, the faithful have a right to infallible guidance and to immunity from any possibility of mistake. And, indeed, if the Church be literally Christ still on earth in all the fulness of His power; if she be not merely a ‘divinely assisted teacher,’ but a ‘Divine Teacher,’ how is it conceivable that she should ever sanction any belief whatsoever that is untrue, or direct the worship and devotion of her children to what is mythical or unreal. Hence comes the extension of the papal infallibility far beyond those matters which were of old considered to justify the assembling of an Ecumenical Council. Almost any important utterance of the Pope relating to matters of faith and morals, or to matters anyway connected therewith, is at once construed as an *ex cathedra* decision, since he is conceived to act in his capacity of guide and teacher of the universal Church. Could Christ sanction a Mass and Office in honour of a saint who never existed or who was not worthy of honour? Could He give us a Collect about the Holy House of Loreto, or the transportation of St. Catherine’s body by angels, if these things were myths? Plainly not. But the Pope and Christ are one and the same ‘Divine Teacher’; hence all these things are infallibly true.

One sees quite clearly how this crude literalism was impossible as long as the fulness of ecclesiastical power was thought to be vested in a rarely summoned Universal Council, and how easy and almost inevitable the fallacy became as soon as it was admitted that it was equally vested in the person of a single bishop. A transfer of Christ’s prerogatives to an occasional assembly is a thought that at once baulks the imagination and suggests qualifications; whereas a wholesale transfer of those powers from one individual to another—from Christ to Peter, from Peter to the Pope—is as simple an idea as that of an hereditary monarchy.

Now, here there is a plain question needing a plain answer. Does the papal infallibility extend further than that formerly allowed to Ecumenical Councils; and if so, is there any clear principle by which that extension can be limited?

Again, we are told that the Pope is not inspired or taught miraculously, but only assisted in learning the truth. Where, then, does this truth lie preserved? There are only two answers worth considering. It lies either in his own mind, or in the mind of the Church at large—or at least of the universal Episcopate. Now the

first supposition practically amounts to a claim to miraculous knowledge; for that any one brain should take in the whole of Christian doctrine, under all its myriad aspects and developments, is quite inconceivable. Moreover, this would in no sense be a development of the vaguer conception of ecclesiastical infallibility, but an essentially different conception; it would make the mind of one man to be the organ of the Holy Ghost and the repository of Christ's revelation, and not the mind of the Church at large—which is the precise charge brought by the Easterns against the teaching of the Roman Church. It puts the Pope outside and over the Church, instead of making him part of her organism. She knows nothing but what he tells her. He is active; she purely passive and receptive. She has nothing to do with the preservation or elaboration of the faith. She does not think or will; he thinks and wills for her. Here once more appears the fallacy of an unqualified vicariate. Christ is the head of the Church, and the Pope is the head of the Church, and no distinction is drawn. It is not noticed that Christ's headship is that of the husband over the wife: they are united but distinct personalities—*duo in carne una*; whereas the Pope, like other bishops, is but a constituent, albeit a principal part of the Church, which is united mystically to Christ; He is as it were a physical or bodily head, and not her moral head and co-partner. But from the unqualified identification of the Pope with Christ—the 'Divine Teacher'—it follows that the Pope is vicariously the *Spouse* of the Church, her ruler and master—a distinct personality standing outside her and above her, even as Christ does; having a mind separate from hers, and to which hers must be obediently conformed. Now, according to the older theology, it might conceivably be held that as the organic head of the Church the Pope might be so infallibly assisted, in crises of life and death threatening the unity of Christendom, as to gauge, and finally to declare, without error the sense of the Church at large. But this function would be his, not as apart from the organism, but as making one with it; so that the immediate recipient of Divine assistance should be the whole Church and Spouse of Christ which speaks with and through her visible head. Nor would this be in conflict with the letter of the Vatican decrees which deny the dependence of papal decisions on episcopal consent, and affirm the validity of extra-conciliar definitions *ex cathedra*; for all that is demanded is that the Pope should *ex professo* put himself in vital touch with the mind of the Church preparatory to declaring infallibly what that mind truly is—a matter not necessarily of votes and majorities, but of tendencies and movements.

Such a conception of papal infallibility, were it only proven, would at least be tolerable, and might claim to be a direct development of former ideas; but the other view, which puts the Pope outside and over the Church in the sense that belongs to Christ alone, which

gives him an active personality, mind, and will, distinct from her passive personality, mind, and will, is as glaring an innovation as could well be imagined, altering, as it does, the very constitution of the Church. Yet how utterly recent Roman theology is permeated with this fallacy no one can fail to see.

Here, then, is another plain question. Is the Pope a ruler and teacher external to the Church, as Christ is? Is his single brain the repository of Christian revelation, or does he but read infallibly the mind of the Episcopate at large, and is he infallible only because his thought and action are the thought and action of that whole body of which he is but part, and which as a whole is the direct and adequate depository of revelation and the recipient of Divine assistance? These conceptions are poles asunder; which pole is the right one?

The pastoral next states that Catholics are bound to give the assent of faith not only to revealed doctrines, but 'also to the decisions of the Church concerning matters appertaining to or affecting revelation'—to those matters which are said to be *de fide ecclesiastica* as opposed to *de fide divina*. This, in itself, is reasonable enough if properly limited and understood. Articles of faith, though they are truths of the supernatural order, are not suspended mid-air and isolated from all connection with natural, unrevealed facts and truths, which condition our knowledge of them, and stand or fall with them for one reason or another. The inspiration of St. John's Gospel was not revealed by Christ: yet, if it be denied, much of Christ's revelation is lost to us. It must, however, be confessed that these subsidiary truths connected with a revealed truth are often very numerous; still more so when one reflects that each of them in turn depends on and carries with it a multitude of other truths. Indeed, seeing how closely interlaced is the whole body and sum-total of natural truths, it is hard to fix any limit at which this *fides ecclesiastica* should stop. Thus the dogma of transubstantiation seems to involve the philosophy of substance and accident; and this in turn may be found to entail the entire system of Aristotelian realism. One ought to know clearly how much philosophy is thus incorporated into the Church's faith. For Pius the Ninth tells us, as stated in the pastoral, that 'it is the duty of every philosopher who wishes to be a son of the Church, and of every Catholic school of philosophy, never to advance anything in opposition to the Church's teaching, and to retract any statements which have drawn on them the censure of the Church.' Now, so far as a philosophy deserves the name, it pretends to be as coherent and necessary a body of truth as geometry. We cannot pick and choose eclectically; we take all or none, because each part involves the rest. Hence in claiming to define particular points of philosophy the Church virtually takes the whole of philosophy under her juris-

diction; she imposes scholasticism as part of that *fides ecclesiastica* which is subsidiary to *fides divina*. Is this an unfair inference? And if there is a limit to be fixed, what is the principle of limitation? And how far does it carry us? A similar difficulty arises in regard to history, anthropology, palæontology, &c., and the whole realm of secular knowledge, which jostles up against revelation at every point. These sciences are by no means unified in themselves or in relation to one another; but this consistent unity and coherence is their ideal. Truth *in itself* is one, though we may not yet have grasped its oneness. Hence, again, in claiming to settle certain points the Church virtually claims to settle all, and takes the whole realm of human knowledge under her jurisdiction. By what limiting principle are we to be saved from this legitimate consequence of the teaching of the pastoral?

If, of course, the exercise of papal infallibility be confined to those rare occasions when the peril of schism cannot otherwise be averted, when every other fallible means has been tried and has failed; if the Pope speaks *ex cathedra* only when he acts as the principle of ecclesiastical unity—as the final, and not the ordinary, court of appeal—then the number of these ‘dogmatic facts’ and points of ‘ecclesiastic faith’ will be brought within narrower bounds.

But if infallibility is at work every day in that indefinitely wide range of matters in any way ‘necessary for the feeding, teaching, and governing the flock,’ it is idle to speak of ‘the vast fields of profane science and speculation open to’ the Catholic philosopher or student. He can neither breathe nor move, lest he knock up against some condemned proposition.

Indeed, the pastoral sees no inconvenience, but much advantage, in this idea that all scientific and historical conclusions and assents should be regarded as but provisional and hypothetical, pending the permission and approbation of the Church, which is thus made the chief teacher in every department.

‘In a state of society in which truths and half-truths and errors without number are confounded together, in which there are at least as many teachers of error as of truth, no more signal benefit could be conferred on searchers after the true and the good than the occasional promulgation by the Holy See of calm and well-weighed judgments concerning truth and error.’

And, indeed, if the Church has inherited from Christ not only a deposit of divine mysteries, but also His insight into and power over nature, all this is undeniable, and the pity is that all philosophic and scientific problems should not be at once referred to the Holy See. But plainly this were to extend the limits of the Church’s ambassadorial powers beyond all that has ever been hitherto claimed, and to fall headlong into the fallacy of the ‘Divine Teacher.’

Another point compassed with much obscurity is the ‘religious

assent' to be given by obedient Catholics to non-infallible authoritative decisions. Though the pastoral forgets to specify so important a point, it is plain that there is question here not of mere external respect and deference, but of a certain 'obedience of interior judgment.' Nor, again, is the motive of this interior assent merely intellectual, springing, as it were, from a recognition of the critical value of the testimony of such experts as ecclesiastical authorities presumably are in their own special subjects; but it is a *moral* motive—a sense that one *ought* to defer not merely to the laws of right reasoning, but to the laws of right conduct.

Now, that such non-rational assent is morally right and reasonable on the part of infants towards their parents, and in general on the part of those whose ignorance and inability make them dependent on those set over them for the formation of their mind, is altogether tenable, if not indisputable. And therefore it should be allowed that, apart from all claim to infallibility, the Church as a guardian of divine mysteries has a right to impose her teaching on those whose spiritual education has been entrusted to her, and that these are bound *in duty* to assent to her teaching as long as clearly contradictory evidence does not bring them under obedience to a still higher rule of assent. Roman controversialists are fond of arguing that because Anglicans do not possess an *infallible* teaching-authority, they possess none at all—a line fatal to their own position.

It is, moreover, idle and impertinent to inquire as to the exact kind of certainty gendered by this voluntary assent, since such inquiry is out of place in reference to assents that, however prudent and right, are not motivated by reasons or arguments. Their subjective firmness should be proportioned to the dignity and weight of the authority which commands.

It is clear that without some provision of this kind not only children, but the multitude who are incapable of independent criticism in so many subjects, would have to remain in darkness for ever.

Let it also be granted by all means that, as in every state of life special grace and assistance are promised to those who use the ordinary means, so to the ordinary teachers and pastors of the Church there is accorded a certain assistance, not indeed infallible, but such as to overrule whatever inculpable mistakes may be made to the eventual good of all parties concerned. But as far as ^(t)any duty of interior assent is concerned, it plainly ceases as soon as manifest reasons render it impossible. A child soon ceases to be obliged to any dutiful interior assent to the beliefs of its parents in ordinary matters. Further, when those in authority are convicted time after time of presuming on their office, of recklessly neglecting the most ordinary means of arriving at the truth, of deciding questions which they have never investigated, they justly forfeit all claim to that internal deference which their instructions should command. Now, the

pastoral allows that, *e.g.*, the Holy Office may condemn an opinion to-day as false, and later may allow that it was true; not merely that it was unproven before and now proven—for that might be the case with an infallible decision. In fact the Holy Office may make mistakes. There is, after all, no such thing as a *quasi-infallible*, a nearly infallible decision. A miss here is as good as a mile; the difference between yea and nay is infinite. Is it, then, possible that we should interiorly assent to a decision, knowing at the time that the same authority which proposes it to our belief has often reversed similar decisions, and may reverse this? Plainly such an assent can be only conditional and probable, in no sense final. But of this and similar limitations there is no indication in the pastoral, just because the Sacred Congregation or the local bishop, no less than the Pope, is a 'Divine Teacher,' of whom it has been said: 'He that heareth you heareth Me.'

Even as regards external submission and respectful silence surely there must be some limit. It is vain to appeal to the authorities of the Church against the authorities of the Church; and history tells us how often the very highest ecclesiastical authorities have made mistakes, and have been tyrannical and unjust, lording it over clergy and laity like the 'kings of the Gentiles,' and how from the nature of the case the correction has come from the public opinion of Christendom, stirred up, many a time, by canonised saints. Extraordinary diseases call for extraordinary remedies; the extravagances of absolutism will justify what under just and constitutional government were unpardonable rebellion.

But this 'religious assent,' interior and exterior, is a duty insisted on by all who allow any sort of teaching-authority to the Christian Church; such, for example, as is claimed by the Church of England, which, though disclaiming infallibility, at least in its isolation, and as separate from the rest of Christendom, does, none the less, profess to be a 'religious tribunal capable of teaching,' not 'with unerring certainty,' but with just that kind of fallible authority which the pastoral claims for local episcopates or for the Roman congregations. The complaint is that, according to the pastoral, this non-infallible teaching-authority is based on arguments and exegeses which would deprive it of all limitation, and make it practically indistinguishable from infallible or œcumenical authority. If the bishop is a 'Divine Teacher,' if he is Christ, the submission due to his mind and will is simply absolute and unqualified.

Another very obscure point is the relation of the laity and the lower clergy—the *Ecclesia discens* to the *Ecclesia docens*. Here the pastoral implies such a relationship as exists between two distinct moral personalities or corporations. The *Ecclesia discens* is conceived as wholly passive and receptive, and the *Ecclesia docens* as active and communicative; they are related, *literally* as sheep and

shepherd; as beings of a different order, with different, if not divergent, interests. As before, the mind and will of the Church is conceived as residing in the Pope, united, for solemnity's sake (not for validity's), with the Episcopate. There the faith is deposited; there it is to be studied and elaborated; and then the results of this thought and study are to be transmitted to the passive, unthinking *Ecclesia discens*, which takes no active share in this vital function of her 'Divine Teacher.' The guidance into all truth promised to the Church had reference directly and immediately to the *Ecclesia docens*, and only through it to the *Ecclesia discens*. In no sense, therefore, does the safeguarding and elaboration of the faith take place in the mind of the laity or the lower clergy.

Now this view ill coheres with what is said so admirably elsewhere in the pastoral in regard to devotions and practices of religion, which, it is admitted, for the most part originate with the laity, and are only guided, or approved, or checked by the *Ecclesia docens*. Historically, it is evident that doctrines and beliefs are but the theoretical implications of devotions; that all through the *lex orandi* has been the *lex credendi*—in a word, that religious progress has been the work of those who have lived and practised the religion; that change has originated from below, and has been only criticised and formulated from above. If this be so, then the relation of the *Ecclesia discens* and *docens* is not mechanical, but organic; it is the whole Church that thinks and wills and acts, though it is through the *Ecclesia docens* that her thought is gathered up, scrutinised, formulated, and imposed as law upon all. It is not a part, but the whole Church, which is the organ of the Holy Ghost.

These two views of the matter are hopelessly irreconcilable, and therefore the intending 'convert' should be told very plainly which he is expected to hold. If the former, then the layman's duty is very simple: he has to repeat the prescribed formulas, to perform the prescribed duties, and leave all the rest to the clergy. There is not only no call upon him for any initiative of mind, will or action, but a positive duty of keeping as quiet as possible; he has no share in the active life of the Church; 'movetur, non movet;' he pays his fare, and takes his seat as so much ballast in the boat of Peter, while the clergy pull him across the ferry. If the latter, then he himself has to pull, and pull hard, though in subordination to those above him. 'I call you not servants, but friends,' says Christ to His disciples; and the reason assigned is their sympathetic and intelligent participation in His designs, as contrasted with the dull mechanical obedience of the unwilling slave. And if the Apostle bids the Episcopate to *rule* the faithful, he also warns them of the danger of 'lording it over the flock,' after the fashion of the 'kings of the Gentiles.' And, according as we take one view or the other

of this question, shall we judge to what extent the rulers of the Church ought to test and gauge (without necessarily being governed by) the mind of the laity. If the operation of the Holy Ghost permeates to these extremities of the ecclesiastic organism; if their thoughts and tendencies are integral factors of the general mind of the Church, they ought manifestly to be taken into account. If, however, only the *Ecclesia docens* be the direct organ of Divine guidance, then the opinions and wishes of the laity are wholly irrelevant, and their criticisms of their 'Divine Teachers' little short of blasphemies, as the pastoral seems to imply. Here, again, a plain answer is wanted to a plain question: Which of these conceptions is the true one? No one claims for the laity or the lower clergy a right to teach or decide, but only a right to speak and to be listened to. Christ as a child gave us the true ideal of 'docility' when He was found in the midst of the doctors, not teaching them, but hearing them, and *asking them questions*; but the pastoral implies that such interrogation is constructive disloyalty.

It is a matter of real curiosity to know what answer the Anglo-Roman bishops could give to these questions. No doubt there are members of the Roman Communion inclined to commend their religion to outsiders by a process of 'paring down'; by holding out hopes that things may be explained away. And it is to be feared that some of Rome's recruits have not entered into that fold by the open door, but have climbed up some other secret way; they have not taken the 'Divine Teacher' view in all its simplicity, but have seasoned it too liberally with salt. After all, it is not what this or that liberal or semi-liberal member of the Roman Church may say that matters, but what their united Episcopate says. And this pastoral brings the question to a sharp and clear issue. It will make many an intending or actual recruit pause, and ask whether after all there is so much to choose between these two evils: on the one side authority weakened to the verge of anarchy; on the other, authority carried to the extravagances of unqualified absolutism. Assuredly authority, and obedience, its correlative, are the remedies for the chief ills of this distracted world, civil and ecclesiastical; but absolutism is not authority, and slavery is not obedience, and yet the distinction is ignored in the pastoral of the Roman Catholic bishops.

It is a common superstition of the uncritical and of a certain section of Protestant controversialists to put every evil down to the Jesuits; but there is a true and sober sense in which the evil in question may, without offence, be characterised by the name of Jesuitism, to distinguish it from that sane and liberty-respecting Catholicism of which it is the perversion. All progress is the result of a series of ever-lessening oscillations from side to side of the golden mean of truth. The revolt of the Reformation gave birth and impetus to the reaction of Jesuitism. The founder of that Order

put the gospel of authority and obedience into the hands of his followers, and if the letter of his own teaching be free from demonstrable extravagance, it cannot be denied that the tradition which grew up about it was saturated with the 'Divine Teacher' fallacy, which is here criticised, and that it made use of exactly the same exegesis upon which that fallacy is founded. 'He that heareth you heareth me' was preached as the revealed basis not only of that obedience due to the inspired Apostles of Christ, but of that to be rendered to all rulers and superiors, civil and ecclesiastical. Had not the Apostle said that servants were to obey their master *sicut Domino*? So much emphasis was to be laid everywhere on the divine nature of all lawfully constituted authority that little or no attention was given to insisting on the limits and conditions under which it was divine. Consult the ascetical works emanating from that Order, and it will be seen how their treatment of the duty of obedience makes straight for this unqualified absolutism; the superior is God, and there is an end of the matter; on his side nothing but rights; on the other, nothing but duties, or, rather, one all-comprehensive duty, namely, passive, mechanical, uncriticising obedience.

When we consider the paramount influence in the post-Reformation Roman Church of the Order which shaped and fostered this tradition; the manner in which its ascetic, moral and dogmatic theology has been passively accepted and assimilated by the less energetic elements of that Church; the way in which its influence has permeated other religious orders and congregations, especially the more modern; and how, at least indirectly, and often directly, its methods and teaching have controlled the education of the secular clergy, it is not unreasonable to call this conception of authority which is here criticised by the name of Jesuitism. Thanks to the struggles of the defeated minority at the Vatican Council, the Roman Church seems just barely to have escaped setting her seal on that system; but all her subsequent developments have been in the direction of this 'Divine Teacher' fallacy.

No thoughtful man who understands the point can for a moment think of submission to Rome until he has received a clear and decisive answer to the questions raised by the pastoral. Many, no doubt, have taken the step and will take it in good faith, without a suspicion of what they are committing themselves to. But it will not be the fault of the Anglo-Roman bishops. They at least have not attempted (as the ardent proselytiser usually does) to 'pare down' their doctrine of absolutism, or to make any comforting distinctions or limitations, or to hold out hopes of future modifications. And for this they deserve hearty thanks. However disposed we might be to accept the Roman Church as a divinely assisted teacher, as a slightly more definite and developed form of ancient Catholicism

with its sane respect for law and liberty, for the rights of subjects as well as for the rights of rulers, we are not at all disposed to accept Jesuitism (in the sense explained), or to acknowledge the Church to be literally a 'Divine Teacher,' teaching just as Christ taught, or even as St. Peter, or even as Moses on Mount Sinai.

In one way at least the evils, as they seem to us, of the Roman system may appear more curable than our own. It may be easier to pull down than to build up; easier to shorten a garment that is too long than to lengthen one that is too short; and in the interests of Christendom we would gladly credit those who bid us hope that there may be a 'paring down' of excrescences in some future not so far off as to be irrelevant. But we must also credit our own eyes, and put facts before hypotheses. Facts do not point to a growth of soberer views as to the extent of that 'little brief authority' with which Christ has entrusted frail men, who need every constitutional check and safeguard if they are not to become intoxicated to their own destruction and that of their subjects. And the Nemesis will not tarry. This very 'liberalism' against which the pastoral is directed is the first-fruits of that harvest of general revolt which absolutism has sown and which absolutism must reap. As detail after detail of teachings, extravagantly ascribed to the 'Divine Teacher,' melts away under the light of history and sober criticism, the whole authority of that Church will be discredited in the eyes of her children; and as all distinction between gold and ore, grain and chaff, vessel and content has been obliterated and banned by authority, those who reject anything will reject the whole indiscriminately, for all equally rests on the authority of 'the Divine Teacher.'

We may freely credit the Roman bishops and those of our own Communion with a disinterested desire to bring about unity by what seems to them a timely insistence on the principle of authority; we may agree that the remedy is to be sought in that quarter. But it must be in a clear, intelligent understanding of authority, its bases and its limits. Else their action will be like that of the hen whose ducklings take to the water—well-meant but ineffectual and noisy remonstrance. Both Episcopates seem in some danger of giving themselves away by the issue of excited and ill-considered utterances, and the result bids fair to be disastrous to that very confidence which it is their aim to secure.

In a document recently presented to the Bishop of Chichester, which represents a wider feeling than that of the single congregation from which it emanates, it is stated that recent action of the English Episcopate is tending to shake the confidence of many in the Church of England, and to expose them to the temptation of seceding from her Communion, or else from sheer despair of falling into utter

indifference. It is a similar danger, though arising from very different causes, to that which threatens the Roman Church.

May a determination on the part of the Episcopate, whether Roman or Anglican, to allow as wide a latitude as possible in all matters of faith and practice not directly contrary to the deposit of faith avert consequences which, in the one Communion as in the other, must prove the occasion not only of disaster to individual souls, but to the cause of Christianity throughout the world.

HALIFAX.

OUR BOER PRISONERS— A SUGGESTED OBJECT-LESSON

I

It may be interesting now, when people are discussing the failure of the peace negotiations, to hear a few of the opinions of the Boer prisoners, to whom I spoke in St. Helena, as to the war and the situation into which it has brought them. I propose therefore to give some of the opinions I heard there, as nearly as possible in the Boers' own words, without any comment whatever on my part. At the end, however, I will venture to put forward some very grave considerations which were forced on my mind during my visit to St. Helena, where I could not but reflect much on the political importance of the prisoners' camps.

I spent a month in St. Helena, where I saw the prisoners constantly. Fortunately my ignorance of Dutch did not hinder me as much as I had feared, for in every group there were several who spoke English and interpreted between their neighbours and me. The system spared me the formality of a regular interpreter, and kept conversation at all times general and spontaneous, where troubles of language disappeared wonderfully.

The Boers treated me with sincerity and confidence, allowed me to ask any questions, and discussed them frankly among themselves in my presence. Under these conditions I did not run the danger of getting into a clique, or hearing only opinions made up for my benefit.

The foreigners in the camp all spoke well of the Boers, and I quote their commendation with great confidence, because they had no illusions. They knew fully the suspicious exclusiveness of the Boer. 'The Boer holds himself first, and every one else a long way after.' Or, as a German said to me, 'A man may say he has influence with the Boers or with the Zulus, for it is the same with both, but he has none at all. They listen very politely. The Boers are very diplomatic, like our peasants at home in Germany. But they do exactly as they like themselves.' The foreigners had lost heavily too in the war, and got little thanks for it, so their verdict might well have been unfavourable. But all their testimony went the same way. 'I do not know how I could have borne a camp of this

kind,' one said, 'if it had been men of any European nation; but these Boers, they are sober, quiet people, there is no harm in them.' 'I know the Boer very well, and I have never known him treacherous.' 'There are fewer low and brutal men among them than in any European nation; the great majority in the camp were respectable, honourable men.' These were the kind of things said to me. The Boer was not given, they said, to drinking, or gambling, or swearing, or cruelty, good-natured, easy-going, like German peasants, anxious to make the best bargain possible, suspicious and diplomatic, wonderfully hospitable, 'a bit rough, for they have gone outside civilisation, but very good material to make fine men out of.'

A teacher in the country who had about thirty in his school told me a desire for learning was growing up. They wanted to be up to the times. The boys' characters were very fair. He found no thieving. 'You know what schools are, but that fault I never once had; they perhaps have less than other people from living solitary, so far apart.' I spoke to several traders of long standing and experience, and did not find one who talked as people here do about 'slimness.' The Boer, they said, was only very suspicious from his ignorance of arithmetic, and you had to convince him you were dealing fair. 'I always made up my accounts for a Boer twice,' one German said, 'for if he once found you wrong in the least trifle, he would never trust you again.'

A fastidious and critical German was greatly struck by their remarkable industry, and all the new trades they had learned in camp. They do the whole of the baker's and butcher's work, take a hand at shoemaking, make excellent and faithful hospital orderlies, do painting and gardening in the island, and have built a new wharf. Unhappily the bare island can give work to but forty or fifty out of the thousands of prisoners; and even the handicrafts they have developed are too few for that big population of perhaps 4,500 by this time.

It is hard to picture the trial which imprisonment means to men accustomed to the wide freedom of the farmer's life.

'I could not read, I could scarcely bring myself to talk about anything, my life seemed gone,' an educated German said to me, who had just come from months of travelling over the wildest veldt. The monotonous idleness, the early falling darkness at six o'clock all the year round, and the want of candles, are conditions which make the perpetual anxiety of the prisoners more overwhelming. 'The men think so much of their wives and children. The children they miss greatly; they are always talking of them.' There is practically no diversion to withdraw their minds from care; for the Boers, with their stern Puritanism, cannot share even the little gaieties which the Europeans try to keep up in the way of music, singing, and acting. 'It is a good way,' said a Boer, after seeing

one of these performances, 'to spend a sinful evening.' I saw some sinking day by day into deeper gloom; and it was pitiful to observe the men, old and young, that carried their wooden stools after the Sunday service and formally ranged themselves round the pastor in a class for special consolation. 'No pen can tell what we have suffered, no pen can ever, ever tell it,' a young giant said to me. One told me of the awful scene in the ship that took them from Natal. There was a storm in which they expected to sink, and at every wave that flung the ship down the men shouted a great hurrah! The captain came to ask this man what it meant. He did not know that shout for death. I feared, as I watched some of these men, that evil would come, and it has come in the form of melancholia, developing into acute and violent mania. Among others I hear Madame Cronje goes about for ever restlessly thinking the English want to burn her and her husband.

Good fighters as they have learned to be, fighting is not their first instinct. A strong and brave young man expressed the matter very simply. 'The people did not want to fight. They had too much to lose. We are not a fighting people.' The one fixed idea of the men was independence. 'You cannot think how free the farmer's life is. Independence is his very existence.' For the Boer is a sort of country aristocrat, free of the veldt, of the conquering and dominant race. The whalers of the Polar Seas that gathered round Tromp and De Ruyter have left their temper to the trekkers of the arid desert. But so far as I could hear this spirit of freedom was not aggressive. The Transvaal Boers that I saw repudiated any idea of domination. They told me a few Johannesburg men had a notion of Dutch supremacy, but the country did not share it. I talked to one of these men, an official. 'You fought before,' I said, 'for the making of a Dutch nation greater than your own State.' 'I admit,' he said (the first who fully admitted it to me), 'that some had that dream, but not the majority of the burghers.'

When I asked the reason of the present troubles the answer was always the same—the Jameson Raid. A trader in a very good position told me how till the raid he had respected the English; but had now completely changed his mind. Before the raid race feeling had died down. 'All was going on wonderfully. There would have been no difference very soon.' A most experienced and excellent old Boer, who knew Kimberley and Johannesburg well, agreed. With all its faults, he said, the country was making progress in friendliness, wealth, and enlightenment, 'if only there had been a little more time.' 'The Jameson Raid!' another said, 'till then we felt we could trust England. But after that how could we trust her? You will never get it out of the minds of the people that the English Government knew of that raid. There were English officers and English soldiers in it. From that moment we

1

mistrusted England. We said, if that is what England does, well, we have no choice!' One of the most respected Boers spoke with deep conviction. Up to the raid, English and Dutch were slowly learning to live together, and understand one another, and to feel they must settle down together: the raid broke up all that. Nothing could exceed the bitterness of a younger man. 'The English have taught us a lesson: they have shown us what they are!' I asked if he ever felt this before. 'Never till the Jameson Raid. I had many friends among them. But now they have taught us a lesson.'

Dutchmen who had given up speaking their old language at home, repudiated English after the raid, and took to Dutch again. Many had gone at their pleasure to either the Dutch or the English Church, as they liked the preacher. 'Come to the English Church with me,' a Johannesburg resident said as usual to an old friend. 'I have never gone to the English Church since the raid,' he answered. A sister in the Cape Colony wrote to her brother, a Transvaal burgher since the raid, now a prisoner. 'I am sorry for you, but I am still loyal.' He answered. 'I am glad you are loyal, because I can expect you to respect in me loyalty to my country when you are proud of loyalty to yours.'

A man who was in a good position in the mines said to me: 'Then Rhodes—he is a very clever man. He has got his thumb (grinding down his thumb) in on the Ministers in England. He got people to give him money, lots of money, for Rhodesia. But he had great drawbacks: first the Kaffir war—that cost much; then the railway; then, last, there is no gold—that is, there is gold, but not of a kind that will pay. And the police he has to keep, there are heavy expenses with that. So Mr. Rhodes, if he is to pay his shareholders, must have Johannesburg. I put it like this. Rhodesia is like a great pot of bean soup. It is a very good soup if you have pork with it. But it is no good without. No one wants to eat it. And the pork is Johannesburg. Then the English people who are with Rhodes, if they do not want to lose their money, and suffer a great loss of money, must follow Rhodes whether it is right or wrong'— 'whether it is right or wrong,' he kept repeating.

The men who had been called out for the raid told me it showed them for the first time that they were unarmed. One man said that in his district only seventy-five out of 1,000 came armed in the first instance; there were more afterwards. In another case, there were twenty-five out of 800. It was with the greatest difficulty they got ammunition. A man applied in Potchefstroom, and could only obtain fifteen cartridges. That experience left an abiding impression on them. Moreover, they were called out in harvest time, and though it was only for three weeks, yet these were the critical three weeks of the year for their harvest; and as it happened

{

to be the first year when they had a chance of recovering from the rinderpest disaster, the loss came heavily on them.

One incident they referred to again and again with intense indignation—the monster petition to the Queen for the franchise got up at Johannesburg. Names were bought at so much a hundred. Men brought round type-written papers professing to be *For* or *Against* the petition, and the signatures were put on separate pieces of paper pinned to these; and many who had signed against the petition found their signatures transferred to the other side. They will never forget the English acceptance of what they consider a shameless imposture.

I never heard a word of criticism of Kruger save in this one respect: 'If he had shot all the raiders there would have been no war now.' But they appreciated his reason. 'We thought the English would have punished the raiders.'

I heard some stories of halting and sluggishness, of cowardice too, at the beginning of the war. 'We could not choose our men, like the English. We had to take them all just as they were.' Boys from offices, called out to fight under inexperienced leaders, have told me the confusion and perplexity that followed, the alarms and panics. The boys themselves, however, began to take notes—it was wonderful how many of the men were taking notes, and how sober their information was—and to discuss the causes of failure and the uses of discipline. In talking of the English soldiers they discriminated; regiments had their characters sharply marked for good or for bad, and in every case they put down as far as possible the name of the commanding officer.

There is no hesitation among them now. A foreign burgher of the Transvaal told me he did not believe any long resistance would be made by that peace-loving, home-loving people. 'For guerilla warfare,' he said, 'you want fanatics, a religious frenzy such as they had in Spain. But the Boers don't want to fight. They think too much of their homes. They are always wanting to go back to their wives and children.' He spoke, however, before new prisoners came in to tell of the farm-burnings. That made a difference. 'Now we are beginning with a new spirit,' one of these new prisoners, a leading trader, said to me. 'I used to hear,' another new-comer said, 'that if you burn a man's house down you make a soldier of him. Now I have seen it all round me, and I know that if you burn a man's house down you make a coward into a hero.' Commandant Wolmarans took me into his tent, where a group of men was gathered, and told me, in strong agitation, the news that had come. His wife had been long dead, and his house, when he went to fight, was shut up. His only son at home, a boy of fourteen, went to live with a sister near. Troops came; his house was blown up with dynamite, and his cattle driven off. (These prisoners had

1

all the fixed belief that Lord Roberts's proclamation secured the safety of the prisoners' farms. Whether it was so or not, that was their understanding of the matter.) The boy ran out with another to save the cattle; they were seized, taken to Johannesburg, and imprisoned in the fort. After two days they were given ten strokes, and sent home. One boy cried bitterly; young Wolmarans stood without flinching, and then only said, 'Now I will shoot the English.' To his father the house-burning did not matter, in comparison with the flogging of his son. 'I once thought,' an intelligent prisoner said to me, 'that every Englishman was a gentleman. I do not think it now. I have changed my mind. There was never in all the world a war so unjust. If it were to begin again I feel so much the justice of the Boer cause that I would go out again and fight, even though I knew the cause was hopeless.' 'We never burned a house, not even in Natal. In all the fighting I saw, property was respected. The property of Englishmen was safe.' One of De Wet's men, taken in August, told me he had never seen a farm burned by Boers, but that he heard since he left that De Wet too had begun burning. D., a 'strong farmer,' spoke with concentrated bitterness of the burning of farms. 'I'd shoot the man who broke his word if he was found. I say nothing against that. But suppose I am a poor farmer, there is no protection for me anywhere. A Boer commando comes and takes my farm. I can't resist. Why is my farm to be burned down?' These men will endure the fate of war, but the least injustice and they are in deep and bitter defiance.

A foreign officer was lost in wonder at the temper of the camp as he saw it from within. 'It is amazing!' he used to say. 'French or Germans or Russians would be cast down in this situation, anxious, humiliated, hanging their heads. But you would think the Boers were conquerors!' I was told that there was at one time a movement among a few men in the camp, ten or twelve, for a petition that they might take the oath of neutrality and go back to their families. My informant knew one of them, an extremely poor man with a large family. The petition never got to the English officers. It was beaten down by the indignation of the camp. 'I do not believe,' he said, 'that if they stay here fifty years, any one will ever make that petition.' From that time public meetings were forbidden among the prisoners.

A man who had taken the oath of neutrality told me how his wife had sent him out to fight rather than have the shame of being taken in his own house. I was going to speak to some men who had been taken up after giving the oath. 'Do not speak to those men,' an old Boer said to me, 'they have bad hearts. They put down their guns when the English come and take them up when the soldiers have passed by. Every man that is taken now ought to be taken on the field fighting.'

The question often arose as to their readiness to yield and come to terms with the English. 'So-and-so told me we ought to be glad to do it. I did not argue. What is the use of talking when you can't have equal talk?' There was a hum of assent to that in the tent.

One day I spoke to a group of typical Transvaal Boers—country farmers, only two of whom spoke English with ease. I would ask a question—my neighbour repeated it in Dutch. All fell to eager discussion, dropping entirely into Dutch when things got very excited; while my neighbour would presently sum up for me—the others leaning forward and listening keenly. If he was not giving their exact meaning they put in some words. If all was right they nodded or added a 'Sicker.' 'What was the origin of the troubles?' I asked. There was the usual answer, 'The Jameson Raid. Till then we always trusted the English Executive, but we saw that the English Government knew something was going on, and did not try to stop it; and they did not punish the men; and the Governor did not send out proclamations warning people not to join until he was forced to do it. Then we could not trust the English Government.' 'Are you all of this opinion?' 'Every one of us. All was going on very well. There was no race hatred: it was dying down. Some of our best friends were English. There would never have been war but for this.' Many of these men had been in the old war of independence. I asked if there was a single one of them who had voted for the annexation. They said not one. If, I said, Shepstone had carried out his policy of representation, &c., and if Lanyon had not come with his measures, would it have made any difference? All replied, 'None at all. We had not given our consent to be English.' They all had still a firm hope of independence. We talked of what they would think if Lord Roberts set up a military government for a time. A straight, brief, vigorous man said something, at which a short laugh went round. I asked my neighbour what it was. He hesitated. 'Yes,' says V., 'say it.' *'He says there will be trouble.'* The others nodded their heads. 'We want to ask you a straight question. We hope you will not take it ill.' 'No,' said I. 'Do you think the English people mean to give us our country, or do they mean to take away our independence?' I said I did not think the English meant to give them independence; the war had cost them much—they did not want another, and I believed they were determined, having annexed the country, to govern it. I was not speaking of what I might myself think one way or the other—I was answering the question of what I judged the intention of England. 'You mean a military governor to be sent out, with a large force to support him, and to make the Transvaal a Crown Colony for a time?' 'Yes,' I said. For a moment they said nothing, but every man sat up straight from leaning forward to hear me, and each turned to his

neighbour with a short, scornful sort of laugh, and a bright kindled face. Then a few words to one another. 'If that intention was carried out,' I said, 'what would you do? Would you give in to English rule?' A pause. 'It's a hard question,' I said. 'You have your farms, your homes, your life there.' V., an upright, bold man, answered, 'I will never live under English rule. I will go to America.' The others talked a bit. Then L. said (he had scarcely spoken before), 'I do not agree. We have done all we can. There would be no help. We must submit.' 'Well,' B. said, 'what do you think?' Says V., 'I want to live under my own Republic; if I cannot do that I will never stay in South Africa.' Then the men put the question to each one. The answers were short. 'I think the same as B.' 'And I the same.' 'I do not agree. We must bow to God's will. If it is His will we cannot resist. We must submit, till the Almighty brings things into some other way.' Two others agreed with him. There was no irritation shown with the party of submission: no remonstrance. I never saw a talk so free and independent. Then V. looked at me and said briefly, 'The most are with us.' No other comment was made. There were seven against submission and three for it in this mitigated form.

Many times I heard the same kind of free discussion. In the tent of a German of the fourth descent, D., there gathered a group of farmers, clerks, railway officials, &c. After some talk I asked if it would be possible for them to settle down under English government. They gave various opinions very simply. One 'could,' another 'thought it would be very hard.' Another said 'perhaps they could'—then a long pause—'for a few years.' D.—himself an excellent type, hard-working agricultural farmer, accustomed to walk ten miles a day, reflecting, observant, moderate—at last said 'it depended on whether the English led or drove the people.' He went back to Shepstone. The promises of free government had not been kept, and Lanyon's autocratic way had settled the business.

Prisoners were vastly amused at a rumour I had heard outside that they were shaving off their beards to show they had lost faith in Kruger. 'I am told,' I said another time, 'that you don't esteem Kruger quite so much since he went away with all that money.' They roared with laughter. 'Oh,' said they 'the money is all right. The President' (they always called him that with formal respect) 'will use that money very well. If he went to Europe it was because he believed he could serve them there.' There is no doubt of the President in their minds. He has all their trust and loyalty. 'He would give the last cent of his money for his country. We have not the least doubt of that.'

An English priest had been telling a Catholic prisoner, a foreigner, that the English had a just and true cause, and the Boers were rebels and scoundrels. 'But I don't believe,' says he to me, 'that *all* the

English can believe that sort of thing. It would not be possible for them *all* to think it !'

It was sometimes said in the island that the farmers had been forced against their wills to go out to war, were now longing to go back, and were expecting wealth and peace under the new rule. They laughed scornfully. 'Yes, forced to fight, but by the English, not by our own Government. We got our orders to go on the 29th,' said one, 'and on the 30th we were in the field. But the day before I had made a bet of a new hat with a man now in the camp that there would be no war. But when it came we fought freely.' Another day, when I mentioned this tale, W. spoke very strongly. Some of his own best friends had been English, whom he had loved. Now a race hatred had arisen that would never, never be extinguished. All declared that nothing but independence would satisfy them or give peace. They still respected 'that part of the English nation that sympathised with their desire for freedom,' but for the rest race hatred had begun. They were very grave. No laughter with these men—who saw farther than the stout farmers of the other day. 'Never, never, never,' said one and all, 'would they settle down under English rule.' I talked of the English hopes of another State like Cape Colony. 'No, never, never,' they said. 'They would stay one, two, three years in camp and not complain, if they had their independence in the end.' Would they be content to have their fortresses dismantled, and no foreign policy, and then govern themselves? 'We must defend ourselves from the Kaffirs.' How many in camp were of their opinion? Ninety-eight per cent. they would answer for. 'There are some who talk of submission,' I said. 'Yes, some who say one thing to us, and another behind our backs.' But the vast overwhelming majority they were sure of. 'Of course there are men everywhere that don't know their own minds—weak ones, vacillating sort of people.'

It is impossible, indeed, after talking to the men in very free intercourse, to lay so much stress as has been done here on the effect of parties and votes in England. That may affect some men in the governing circles, though not, as far as I could gather, to the fanciful extent people talk of here. But when a movement has touched the people, it is the people that take the lead, and the Boers were not hanging their hopes much on England or on Europe, but on God and on their own courage. Some of the prisoners once asked me if Europe would intervene. There was no chance of that, I said. A big man was leaning in the door of the tent. 'Then we must help ourselves,' he said; 'we will not look to European Powers. We have got to trust in ourselves.' 'The English will get that country,' a foreigner said to me, 'but they will get a dead country.' 'I was born in Cape Colony: my best friends have been English. Now this evil has been done,' a herculean young man kept repeating in a

low monotonous voice, while he was trembling in every limb; 'the English have done this'—he paused—'but it will come out—with washing. There will be very few Boers to end this war; that was always my opinion.' A very fine young man remarked, 'We never knew what we would have to lose, what this war would mean to us. But we were fighting for right. Ah!' he cried out, 'I wouldn't have been fighting on the side of England.' Once I spoke of a theory I had heard strongly asserted, that the 'country party' of the Transvaal held for Kruger, and that the 'town party,' more enlightened, would be ready to give him up and accept the better government of the English. 'I should say it is just the other way,' said one. This they all confirmed.

One thing struck me much—the character of the rumours that ran round the camp as compared with the rumours that the telegraph serves up to us. The prisoners who came in told that to the last moment the 'President's' hope was firm; that he never gave in; that he had sent word to De Wet: 'Carry on the war, but spare my burghers' lives. Fight if you are forced; otherwise retire and lose no men.' He was to keep the game going without waste of life, while Kruger went to Europe. In one or two cases, where there was some exaggerated tale of a boy's valour in the field, for example, some one always went round and brought back the sober version. De Wet had ammunition, they told me, for two years. They had kept very careful lists of the dead on their side, and as far as possible among the English. They reckoned up the army then, in October, in the field to be 15,000 (some enthusiasts said 30,000, but they were suppressed), and told the probable number with each commando. 'But the 15,000 we have now,' they said, 'are worth the 30,000 we had at the beginning of the war.' De Wet had said he would never give in, and not one of them imagined he ever would. There was the deepest indignation at Prinsloo's surrender. Every man was convinced there was treachery there, and De Wet had declared that if he ever saw Prinsloo he would shoot him with his own hand. A giant straight from De Wet was telling how De Wet fed and clothed his men out of the abundance of his captures. 'I suppose you had champagne and cigars,' said one. 'No, but we had meat and bread enough.'

'There is one good thing in this war,' a Boer said to me. 'When we get back we shall all be one. All sides will understand one another now.' 'There were foreigners I used to distrust,' a man remarked another day, 'but I cannot do so any more after this war. They stood to us bravely. I was surprised at the loyalty they have shown.' 'We have been taken early,' some man said, 'but from what we hear our young men have been brave.' I saw a crowd of men round a notice-board. They were reading the list of prisoners sent to Ceylon, and asked a hundred questions of their welfare.

'They are our fellow prisoners.' 'We are anxious for them.' In a hospital ward one day the men asked if I had heard a rumoured offer from the Free State that they would give up De Wet in exchange for all the prisoners from Ceylon and St. Helena. No one believed it, but they fell to discussing the idea. 'Never,' said an old Boer, 'will I have another man's life taken for mine.' 'I do want to get out from here,' said a boy sadly, but he did not dare to repeat it. 'Why,' answered another, 'do you think we should let that man who is doing such a work be given up? The whole camp here is not worth him!' 'When a man shows a love for his country like that,' said a middle-aged trader, 'we will never betray him.'

Their fixity of spirit shows itself also in their religious conviction. 'We have a sure hope, God will see us righted,' so they would say. The rumour had gone among the people that they must be tried and sifted, till the evil had fallen out from among them, and that the English must first overrun the whole land before the Boers would be allowed to drive them out. 'The little company of Gideon is still left—it is fighting now,' the prisoners would say to the friends who met the trains of captives. As a Russian said to me, 'We understand the Boers; for we, like them, think that every verse in the Bible is as true as a German would think a treaty with the Chancellor's seal on it.' The matter struck them very simply. 'England is mighty, but God is Almighty.' They would go on fighting till His Will was clear. 'If we fail it is not His Will we should be a nation now.' All day long the sound was to be heard of a group somewhere in the camp raising their psalm of faith. I spoke of the decree of annexation. 'There is many a slip between the cup and the lip,' one answered. 'We think that.' Every morning at dawn there is a prayer in the whole camp. Every man sings and prays at the door of his tent. Then again at seven in the evening. 'We trust in God. A. [an Englishman] tells us it would be horrible to him to think the great Creator would interfere in a cause like ours.' I once asked what would happen if the young men lost hope. 'Then there would be many, many sick in the camp.'

Yet this hope alternates with the deepest despair. It is hard to describe the alarm with which they look to the future of the Transvaal under English rule. Ruin, banishment and degradation stand in front of them. 'If there is no hope anyway,' they say, 'let us die fighting. We have suffered so much now that we may as well go on.' It was the most thoughtful and intelligent whose fears were the most overwhelming; and the most educated of the foreigners, traders and others, shared all the apprehensions of the Boers. There were men born in Australia, Canada, or the Cape Colony. It would be possible, they said, for those who had known English rule elsewhere to settle down under it in the Transvaal, if things were fairly equal, 'but we begin with nothing. I fear we shall be marked men.'

'We shall be allowed no opportunity.' 'I could live under the English Government if there were going to be equal rights for all,' said a Scandinavian burgher. 'But that will not be. I know it just as if I had seen it. There will be equal rights promised, and they will look very well on paper. But the Boer will be pushed back and back. The Outlander will take everything. There will be no equal rights. How miserable, how miserable the Boer farmer will be under English government.' I mentioned some scheme of government then much talked of. 'Why, what would be the meaning of that!' cried a young man. 'England said she was coming to make us better off than before—for our good. I suppose she would have to give us at least as much as we had before!'

'Will the mines be taxed for the war? Who will pay? We can't. We are ruined'—this was a constant problem. Some half-Englishmen who expected to go back under British rule had it much in their minds. 'If heavy taxes are laid and cannot be paid, and the farms are sold, there will be a rebellion. The Dutchman will not suffer his farm to be sold.' 'So you think,' a German asked me, 'all the former officials will be put out of their places, and new men put in? When Germany took over Hanover, all the old officials remained as before.' 'I suppose England could not be so mad as to leave martial law for any time in the Transvaal. There will be many complicated law questions swarming up—international questions and property questions. Martial law can never settle the Transvaal. There must be very able civil courts, with the best possible men in them.'

There was nothing the prisoners watched with more anxiety than the new appointments in the Transvaal Government. Without a single exception, as far as I could learn, every Boer is convinced that the capitalists made the war, and that having defeated them his next object will be their ruin or extinction. Another man they fear. 'The curse of South Africa is the colonial Jingo,' a farmer said to me. From the Boer's point of view, if these people come all into power, it is not worth while to make peace. 'What confidence can the Boers have?' said one. 'Men are appointed of the lowest character, bitter partisans, ready to be informers against their private enemies. Look at —, a common drunkard, that is what I call him.' True or not, they have the fixed idea the colonials and capitalists intend to break and ruin them utterly. One very good man, a German, was absolutely hopeless. He was a trader, and intends to go back; but he is absolutely certain the Boer farmer is doomed. The least tax on his land for years to come would sell him up. He is at the mercy of the dominant colonials, and they will have no mercy. So he used to augur, nor could he see any way of hope.

I need not say what every student of history or of man must

know—how deep is the gulf that separates the Boer who is standing firm to the last for the independence of his country, from the Boer who has turned to the side of the English. For a long time to come the severance must go down as deep as the roots of human nature, and be the cause of poignant sorrow. In any settlement this fact must not be forgotten.

II

I would turn now to a question of the gravest consequence—the political problem with which England is brought face to face in these camps. I do not think the importance of this can be exaggerated. To any one who has seen Deadwood Camp it must form a subject of ceaseless reflection and anxiety.

The situation is grave enough. Twenty thousand Boers are now in camps under English government. It is their *first direct experience* of English rule, and their minds are greatly affected by these first experiences.

The majority have never been away from their own farms before. The impression of English methods which they carry back will be a thing never forgotten when they are restored to the veldt. They have long memories; and their children and children's children will hear of St. Helena.

These prisoners, moreover, are not in the least like the captives taken in an ordinary war. They are a whole people—boys of thirteen, men dying of senile decay, entire families who have gone out together, grandfather, father, and sons; whole districts whose population is gathered there, hale and infirm, fighting-men and men who have never been out; traders, schoolmasters, labouring men, big farmers.

No system of military discipline, even if worked by angels, could ever suffice for this work. It would fail with Europeans—how much more with this people, accustomed to track their way over the veldt by the stars, riding as owners over those wide solitudes, the priests and patriarchs of their homes, with the stubbornness of free men, and the pride of a dominant race! It must conspicuously fail in alleviating the special anxieties and terrors of prisoners in these camps.

I urge this, not as a sentimental but as a political consideration. For it is proposed to restore these people to a country where we must live side by side with them as fellow citizens. The problems of that settlement are so great that we put off their discussion until it is forced on us. But we dare not too long forget that the life in the camps does, in fact, mean all the difference between sending back angry and hostile men to South Africa, or men who have learned what there is best in the English idea of freedom. It means the difference between intolerable friction in the future and the first beginnings of a real comprehension.

The camps have grown up, as it were accidentally, without any policy having been thought out for their management, except in the external matters of providing for the food, health, and security of the prisoners. It is easy to see how this has been so, when it was supposed that a few weeks only had to be provided for.

Unfortunately, it is equally natural that the same haphazard policy should have been continued while months begin to roll into years. For the camps may be viewed from two aspects. The War Office, which is supreme, is only concerned with the prisoners as men suffering captivity for their action in the past: it is a sort of detaining agency. The Colonial Office, which is without any natural authority, has, however, a special interest in the prisoners as the men with whom great parts of South Africa must, in future, be re-peopled. There is no meeting-point between these two views—worse than that they are, in a very real sense, contradictory.

By a series of natural chances, therefore, while certain of the external and material details of camp life have been worked out with the necessary attention and method, there still remain questions of a higher order which no one has the power to consider at all. There is the whole problem of the intellectual and moral impression produced on the prisoners, and the political ideas presented to them, with the effect such things have on the hearts of men, and the lasting influence of these feelings in history. And the practical result of the whole matter is that the War Office, by methods drawn from its special sphere of experience, is working hard to turn out over the Dutch States 20,000 men who will soon drive the Colonial Office to desperation. The Colonial Office meanwhile has no authority to interfere, but when its day of trial comes it will again have to call on the War Office to help it out of the trouble.

Since, then, the conditions of the camp are so peculiar, since the time of distress is so long, and the magnitude of the question is so great and so increasing, should there not be some grave consideration of the adaptation of government to the special necessity? Is it impossible that a system of dual control and divided responsibility should give way to a reasonable policy? Otherwise a great opportunity, unique in the history of the world, for conciliation and preparation for a future settlement will be lost.

Here, I used to reflect at St. Helena, is an opportunity for a statesman, and a statesman of high quality. The situation is completely out of the ordinary. It cannot conceivably be met by sending out a colonel and a militia regiment—however excellently these may be fitted for the usual tasks of military administration. What we want out there is mind, and the best mind in England might be sent out with profit. It is a mission of the kind for which the eighteenth century could give a Bishop Berkeley, and we cannot afford to

replace a Bishop Berkeley by the best and most patriotic militia in England.

The first essential is to form a link between the government of the camps and the future settlement of the conquered States in South Africa, so that the one should be a fitting preparation for the other. This might, I believe, be done without much difficulty.

There are now at the Boer camp at Deadwood an officer commanding the camp with a militia regiment whose officers are only concerned with guarding the camp. These are under an officer commanding the troops in the island.

Suppose that under the latter an overseer or officer of the camp could be appointed, with the idea that he should be not merely a temporary guardian of the prisoners, but that he should return with them ultimately to their country. He might be an officer or a civilian. The important point is that he should have tact and skill as an administrator, sympathy with the people, and the power and desire of gaining their good will.

Since the term of imprisonment seems indefinitely lengthened, it becomes all the more important to make the camp a place of political education where the Boers might gain an insight into English government which they cannot now possess, and which it is desirable they should have some means of learning. The long captivity does create a new situation, in view of which military administration might possibly undergo some slight changes. Why could not such an officer devise a scheme to give the Boers a real object-lesson in self-government after the best English traditions? The conditions of the island would make the experiment perfectly safe. There are among the Boers men of probity and intelligence whose influence would be exercised with advantage. The details of camp administration such as I have in my mind would be tedious, and even sound trivial, to describe, but those few who have ever seen a life of restraint and monotony such as that at Deadwood know that nothing is trivial which happens every day, and that the smallest details can produce profound moral results. Every opportunity, therefore, no matter how trifling, should be made use of to show that Englishmen respect the principle of self-government, and to develop the honourable co-operation of the Boers in the discipline and management of the camp.

With an officer whose expectation it was to return to South Africa with the prisoners everything would be considered with a view to the time of restoration. He would be the protector and representative of the camp. He would easily learn Dutch, of which a previous knowledge would not be necessary, and his intercourse with the prisoners, if he understood his business, would inspire confidence, and make them feel that, on their return, they would have a capable and intelligent interpreter between them and the Government.

The Boers are very much affected by personal influence. They spoke with grateful and touching remembrance of every officer who had shown them courtesy or consideration. 'They bear hardship well,' an intelligent German among them told me, 'but kindness is a thing they need, for they are a kind people.' Every one who knew them well told me the same thing. 'There'll be trouble if the English try to break the Boer. He will be led. He will not be driven.'

The camp possesses one advantage of which I must say lamentably little use has been made. It gives an opportunity such as has never occurred before of obtaining at first hand, and personally, a true knowledge of the Boer—ignorance of whom has led us to such grave and unexpected situations. The officer in charge of the camp should use his opportunity to the utmost, for such knowledge would be invaluable to the Colonial Office in the settlement of these people on their return to Africa. Here at last we can (if we choose) drop rumour and lay hold of fact: just as the Boer on his side (again if we choose to take the trouble) can be given a chance of seeing England as we really wish him to see it, and can learn to know us as we should best like to be known. I confess the impression he receives in some ways is one that filled me with sadness and regret, and might with little trouble be amended.

The St. Helena prisoners come from definite tracts of country—one might say that the whole population is there of certain districts, such as Rustenberg and Potchefstroom, for example, and so on. An official in charge could therefore become acquainted with the whole male inhabitants of a territory the capable administration of which at a later time will be a matter of the utmost importance. Knowing the men personally, he will not have to depend on rumour for their condition or character. The Boers have, not unnaturally, the sense that no one knows, or ever will know, what they have to say for themselves. This, so evident to them in the past, is intensified by the actual conditions of camp life. Any one can see that there can be no equal talking between a commanding military officer and a prisoner. 'You can't answer an officer,' they would say, with a rage in their hearts. A distance has to be kept: accidents of humour or surroundings may increase that distance to a surprising extent. And the prisoner forms his settled conclusion that for the Boers there will be no means of communication with an English Government.

This becomes of extreme importance where the Boer knows that he has something very necessary to be said on certain fundamental questions. There ought to be a great deal of talk with him over the native problem, on irrigation, farming, how to develop the population, and many other subjects from which both sides might profit, as I had reason to perceive. The Boer is interested to talk, and conversation of a free and open kind on serious questions is of the very first importance.

It is obvious, however, that such conversations would have little value should any attempt be made to persuade them to express a change of opinion. To respect their convictions will be the only way to secure such information as the best and most honourable amongst them can give.

The Boers are excited by an extreme alarm as to the military rule that awaits them, and the predominant influence of Johannesburg capitalists in the future administration. They believe that they will be starved and sold out of their farms, and crushed out of the country. They fear the effect of colonial bitterness, and that the Government, easily accessible to the English, will by language, distance, and prejudice be alienated from them: so that no appeal of theirs will ever reach it.

English people here, safe from all danger, will laugh at terrors of the Boers as the fruits of waywardness and ignorance. They are not the fruits of either, and they cannot be neglected by those who study the camp in the interests of future peace. If the view should unhappily prevail that these dark apprehensions are a sort of fitting war-penalty that we have no concern to appease, the difficulties of the future will be doubled and quadrupled.

The Boer prisoners are singularly helpless. Their fate, and the fate of South Africa, is in the hands of the English people. The Colonial Office, with its mind turned to the future, cannot watch with too great solicitude the relation of the camps to the future settlement of the country.

•
•
•
ALICE STOPFORD GREEN.

THE NATIONAL THEATRE

The National Theatre. What does it mean? Or does it mean anything? Is it part of the awakenings of England in her power of possession and achievement to a sense of her impotence and loss? Her loss of reverence for beauty and the unconscious joy of Life? We have befouled our rivers and atmosphere, we have well-nigh blotted out the sun with our smoke, we cannot build cathedrals, we cannot pray as once we could, we seem doubtful of our ability to raise a fitting monument to our late lamented Queen. We cannot collectively mourn or rejoice in a manner becoming to the mighty people we know ourselves to be. Once we could do little work that was ugly, now we can produce little that is beautiful. For luxury and toys we have bartered many of the necessities of national life. Tied and bound by the chain of our errors, we cannot yet grasp the full promise of our inheritance. Good Lord, deliver us from the ugliness that has cast its shadow over our land!

The Boers say the town-bred Rooineks have lost their eyes and ears—they cannot observe. What is there for the man in the street to observe? We pull down most of the buildings that are beautiful, we banish Nature from our cities, we grub up the trees and grass, silence the birds, and give him little in exchange but stucco and mud and ill-dressed people hurrying past a background of flaunting advertisements to an accompaniment of steam whistles and hooters. Then in a periodical fit of repentance, if there is a bright time in the financial market, Mammon says 'Let us buy some art,' and is surprised to find a scarcity of artists. Money has been his standard, money has been his god, but money alone cannot buy atonement with the goddess of beauty for the years of his neglect. O Baal, hear us! Cry louder; perchance he is asleep in his counting-house, perchance he is a-hunting 50 per cent. We have been so busy searching out the mistakes of Ruskin, Carlyle, Morris, and other prophets, that we have given little heed to their wisdom.

We analyse, criticise, prate culture and æsthetics, try to write articles in *The Nineteenth Century*, and forget that the handmaids of art are self-denial, activity, and simplicity. Religion! Art! A nation cannot pray that cannot build a temple; it cannot erect a

monument to its Queen if it cannot properly house her people. Where are the artists? We need not wonder. We should be thankful that they have not all become in despair moralists, satirists, caricaturists, or faddists and buffoons; thankful that there are enough still left to help tidy up one of the world's chief workshops.

Neighbouring States have got into the way of talking of us as played out, as effete, sunk in the materialism of our prosperity. Not yet. The war, if nothing else, has proved them wrong. In the same spirit of duty and unselfishness which we have shown in many a recent crisis shall we win back some of the beauty that has faded from our midst—shall we have the right to speak once again of fair and merry England.

Εὐτυχῆ! We are at last beginning to realise that many of our dwellings are unsanitary as well as unsightly, that our citizens and children need playgrounds and swimming-baths, our soldiers fields for exercise. We have learned that patriotism cannot be expected from those to whom we have denied the conditions of a happy and dignified life, that the vitality of the strongest nation will sooner or later decay in the presence of unloveliness. So we have set to work to tidy up the workshop, and naturally the theatre is included in the scheme of tidiness—the chief art or recreation except the public-house for many thousands of toilers; one of the few means of bringing change and brightness to their lives, of lifting them out of themselves beyond this ignorant present. 'I like *Macbeth*,' I heard a Northern country artisan say—'I felt I could do a better week's work after seeing it.' At the same time, as showing forth the eye and body of the time its own form and pressure, the dramatic is more liable than other arts to reflect contemporary weakness or folly. Most people, I think, would agree with Mr. Henry Arthur Jones that the theatre should be able to fulfil its function of giving noble pleasure to the people better than it does at present. Mr. Jones in his able diagnosis in the March number of this Review described some of the symptoms of the disease. Many writers and critics will, I think, agree with him that, though we may congratulate ourselves on the excellence of some modern plays and players, the beauty and accuracy of *mise-en-scène*, the elegance and refinement of some of our modern players, we have undoubtedly to deplore under the present system—

A loss of technique, of versatility and spontaneity. (The growth of mechanical accuracy has proved somewhat fatal to inspiration.)

The absence of any kind of school or training-ground for actors.

The difficulty of finding a company suitable for and willing to try dramatic experiments with old and new plays. *

National Theatre by all means—but in what form? And what is meant by it? Some people seem to think that all that is needed is a large sum of money to be provided by somebody, with a theatre to

be erected regardless of cost, with a company of actors from somewhere to be somehow collected by somebody, that a series of plays shall be written by somebody, that the scheme shall be approved of by a number of somebodies, and that everybody will come and everybody will be satisfied, and the problem will be solved. Who is somebody? And how soon will somebody start off to do something else?

The National Theatre, I take it, is of the spirit, and not only of bricks and mortar. No one theatre could possibly produce all the existing forms of drama. It will be represented at different times, in different places, by different theatres, managed on different systems, worked for by different authors and actors, supported by different publics, produce different kinds of plays, meet with different amounts of success. One theatre will be financed by the artist, another by the speculator; one may possibly be subsidised or endowed by a syndicate, the municipality, or in the dim future even by the State. All will be national if they produce good work, helpful to the best life and thought of the nation. Having built our theatre, well proportioned and beautiful, well equipped and endowed, we will call it National, if you will, but must remember the obligations and limitations of the title. And now our difficulties begin. How are we to set about finding worthy plays and players?

We have for years neglected our theatre—left it to chance, out in the cold. Or we have treated it as a luxury, a fashion, a toy, a pleasant soporific, an amusing aid to digestion—anything but as a necessary part of the life of every well-ordered community.

This attitude of indifference and caprice on the part of the nation toward Drama has made the success of any dramatic undertaking, uncertain under the happiest conditions, still more a matter of speculation. The risks involved, the rise in the value of building land, the increased cost of mounting and of advertising, have tended to emphasise the importance of the financial to the detriment of the artistic.

This tendency of the art to drift on to the lines of a game of poker has lowered the standard of taste and helped to sever the theatre somewhat from the close connection it enjoyed in its palmy days with the great spirits of the age.

Managers are perpetually inquiring what it is the public wants. The public never knows what it wants till it gets it; but it nearly always in the end prefers the good to the bad when given any choice in the matter, and it is somewhat puzzled in its standards of taste by the vagaries of theatrical 'blind man's bluff' and 'The devil take the hindmost.' For this condition of things the public and the critic too often blame actors, managers, and authors, whereas the truth is the problem has grown well-nigh too difficult for any individual. Most actors make some sacrifice in order to follow

what is to them, in the truest sense of the word, their calling. It is difficult enough for actors in favourable circumstances to perfect themselves in work that seems so simple and is so complicated. Work, too, that, in trying to hold the mirror up to Nature, so transparently betrays its shortcoming even to the most unlearned. When, moreover, the actor has to fight and struggle for opportunities and conditions of artistic service, small wonder or blame if he should at times despair and yield to the materialism all around him. The problem is well-nigh too hard for the artist to solve unaided. It is for the public to organise measures for saving the theatre, where necessary, from the intolerable tyranny of the dividend. In an artistic age the organisation of an art may safely be left to the public and the artist. The artistic interest and the commercial should, and in the history of most arts, if taken over a long enough period, do, coincide. It is not altogether so with the theatre of to-day. In considering this point we must keep in mind that dramatic art is liable to be influenced more than any other by its surroundings. Its popularity, its immediate contact with the public, its intensity and transience of effort, make it peculiarly susceptible of evil and of good. Now, as Mr. Jones rightly says, there has been a marked and encouraging output by modern English writers of high-class work in more than one branch of drama. But ought we not to expect more, seeing the enormous number of theatres that are built and building? Could not some influence wider-reaching than a mere culture craze or fashion shield our stage from the vulgarity and sensationalism that sometimes thrust their way in from the sordid streets? Again, could we not see more often those masterpieces of our own and other languages for whose production other States pay large subsidies? Could we not also do something to make dramatic experiments, whether by master or apprentice, easier and cheaper than they are at present? 'Poor X!' his play will be killed by long rehearsals before it reaches the audience,' I once heard a clever actress remark. To all these questions our theatre might, if wisely managed, give a helpful answer. It might help to elevate and keep before the public a high standard of taste. It would be a guide to theatres more directly dependent on their receipts—first, as to what the public did desire; secondly, as to what they could be led to desire. At the same time, the competition of these theatres would prevent it becoming merely academic and formal. All very well in theory, some one will observe; but if Mr. Jones's lament over the rapidly decaying technique of the modern stage is true—and it is generally so admitted—where are the players able to carry out such a programme successfully? The older members of the dramatic profession have their place, their public, and their ministry; the younger members have not had that training which has given our leaders their proud position. Well, 'where there's a will there's a

way' is a favourite English maxim, and that way could be made smoother by the National Theatre we are building in the clouds.

The chief causes of the decay of histrionic art are—(A) the inevitable and in some directions beneficial shifting of the burden of management from the artist to the financier, (B) the unlimited long run, (C) the gradual extinction of the old stock company with a repertoire of pieces, (D) the absence of any school or systematic training.

A has been touched on in preceding paragraphs. It will be sufficient here to note that the decline of acting enhances the need of gorgeous *mise-en-scène*, catchpenny advertisement, profits on bars, programmes, and cloak-room, star artists at enormous salaries, world-wide advertisements, and the whole general expenditure of the unfortunate financier.

Art is art and business is business; but if a profession that undertakes to sell beautiful work should employ much of its time and capital in trying to palm off on the public that which is ugly, and use a system that makes the production of its commodity more and more difficult and costly, it could not be said to follow the canons of either art or business.

B, C, and D—partly cause, and partly effect—may be examined more or less together.

Actors of experience will differ as to the effect of a long run on their own work or on the general character of the production. Some actors get stale and tired of a part sooner than others. Again, the same actor will get dull and lifeless in one part much sooner than in another. Some artists (but I fancy they are the exceptions) can go on playing a part for years without apparently losing zest or spontaneity. Miss Ward in *Forget-me-not* is one of many notable instances. 'Not know me! My dog Schneider would know me,' mutters Rip van Winkle, when the bank declined to cash a cheque for him.—'Oh, Mr. Jefferson, is it you?—certainly, with pleasure.'

I think probably this will be found more frequently in actors' parts—*i.e.* parts which owe their creation more to the actor than the author, or admit, at any rate, of more varied treatment according to the mood of the actor than those characters which come forth from the author's brain perfected, permanent types of humanity. In *Hamlet*, for instance, it is difficult to fit the part to the mood. It will generally be found more satisfactory to try to fit the mood to the part.

On the other hand, Salvini and others—including, I believe, Jean de Reszke—would never play a part like *Othello* more than three times in the same week for fear of getting stale in their work. Our distinguished chief, Sir Henry Irving, is said to be never greater in *Shylock* than when playing it in a repertoire bill. Whatever the effect may be on the experienced actor, I think most people will agree with Mr. Jones, that it is hard under the present system for a

beginner to get that varied experience which is indispensable to the attainment of proficiency. Certainly it is harder for the manager and author to find artists suitable for their purpose than it was fifteen or twenty years ago. These were the doctrines impressed on me years ago at the Lyceum by such artists as Miss Ellen Terry, the late Lady Gregory, better known as Mrs. Stirling, Sir Henry Irving, Messrs. Terriss, Meade, Howe, Fernandez, and others; and my experience confirms me in the belief that they were right. The above artists, I think, gained their experience in stock companies of one kind or another. Indeed, it would be safe to say that no actor has reached the first rank in his profession without having undergone some such training, or its equivalent.

Fine schools they must have been, those old stock companies, judging from the men and women they produced. The modern actor may have gained something in intelligence and refinement, as far as these go, since the ban was taken off the stage; but there is an old adage, 'You don't need brains to act, you need guts,' and 'it was the ruin of our art when actresses possessed evening dresses and actors went to evening parties.' There is a certain amount of truth in this grumble of the old actor. Before the stage became fashionable it showed some force of character to run the risk of losing the paternal inheritance or receiving the paternal curse—certainly a different attitude of mind to that of Mr. Vezin's historic aspirant, who spent one half of his time proclaiming his talents and the other half in thanking God that he did not need them. 'Too good to be any actor,' said one old blue-chin: 'let him study hard for seven years, and then pray hard for another seven that the Lord will make him good enough to be an actor.'

Mr. Jones has not, I think, quite done justice to the old stock actor. Very often rough and uncouth, he acted in queer places—sometimes a deserted chapel, a barn or school, a big room over a slaughter-house or over an inn. It did not matter to him if the rat careered over the stage with his pet hare's foot in its mouth, that the sparrow twittered in the flies, or the snow beat in between the tropical borders. He had queer props.—the proverbial eight-day clock that struck eleven while being lowered into Ophelia's grave when doing duty for a coffin, while on the Danish tombstone close by the scene-painter had enscribbled the names of his enemies, commencing with Sergeant Moriarty, R.I.C. He resented being called an artist; it savoured to him of cant. He was a bread-and-butter actor, not a crutch-and-toothpick toff. He would undertake the longest part with one night's study. He would 'keep in the picture' of the most elaborate scene with only one rehearsal. When his words failed him, he *ponged*. When he appeared by accident in the wrong scene, he soliloquised, addressed heaven, and made an exit. Text he despised, context he ignored, the script he had returned to the prompter; but he knew his business, which

was part of *the* business. 'Enough! let others, especially authors and managers, learn theirs.' He and his comrades, however, had acquired a simplicity of style, a roundness of voice and gesture, that we nowadays often look for in vain. The stock season, with its varied experience, gave our older actors, while yet young and malleable, technique, resource, and self-possession. In this way they acquired spontaneity, versatility, dignity of gesture, deportment and elocution, directness, and unselfishness. In this way, too, was learnt that selflessness and simplicity which is the accompaniment of all first-rate work, without which the elaborated elegance of the most ingenious modern is of little avail—the unselfishness which does not make capital out of the mannerisms of a limited personality, but rather extends its own individuality, by identifying it with the universal.

It is just these points wherein the modern school seems lacking—force, breadth, spontaneity, versatility, elocution, grace, simplicity, freedom from self-consciousness. How can we regain them? We have worshipped success so long, we have got to think every theory sound that makes money, and we wake up one day wishing to put our houses in order, and find we have well-nigh lost the power. Just as Ruskin and Morris preached that before we could again build houses we should have to set to work to learn to make honest tables and chairs, so must some of us modern actors set to work to learn the first principles of our profession, and see that for the future the lesson is made easier for beginners.

The excellences referred to above as the outcome of the old stock season, with its ever-changing repertoire, were acquired in the best school—namely, the art workshop; before the best teacher—the audience; alongside the second-best teacher—the trained professional and the stage manager.

In addition, the older actor had endless opportunities for private tuition, for love, money, or a drink from his fellow-workers. Now our theatre—as yet in the clouds, though foreshadowed by Mr. Henry Arthur Jones—could be of incalculable advantage as a school to impart, as far as may be, a similar course of instruction. It could supplement the training of those individual teachers to whom many of us owe so much, by giving their pupils opportunities of acting and being rehearsed as members of a crowd on a stage with trained professionals, and of periodically submitting their efforts to the public in more important rôles at the performances given periodically by the students. Every actor can tell dozens of stories showing how valuable a teacher his audience has been to him. Mr. Vezin, if he will allow me again to quote him, tells an instructive story of Hendrichs. The great German Hamlet came off the stage one day and said to his fellow-actor, 'I have learned the effect at last which I have been attempting for years.' 'Well,' said his friend, 'but they laughed at you.' 'Yes,' replied Hendrichs, 'but that

laugh has taught me how I will to-morrow make them weep.' Nearly all of us have been cured of some trick or taught some truth in a similar way, and the silent education is always being carried on by the bond which connects us in some mysterious way with the awe-inspiring aggregate of human souls that make up an audience.

Besides the rehearsal class and practice on the stage, our school, or, if you prefer it, our theatre would give lessons at reasonable rates in elocution, elementary singing, fencing, calisthenics, dancing, deportment and gesture—studies, be it observed, that in the old stock days were deemed indispensable. Edmund Kean, for example, was a most accomplished fencer. Only the other day I came across an old gentleman whose father, when quartered in Ireland, had with other officers of his regiment taken a series of fencing lessons from the great actor, then in his period of poverty and hardship. All possible opportunities of athletic exercise would be offered—supplemented doubtless by recreation at the rifle-butts and the drill-ground—in order to keep fit and disciplined the fair mind in the fair body. Then there would be lectures on sword-play, costume, and general subjects connected with the dramatic and the sister arts; expeditions to museums and art galleries, to study expression, pose, and grouping. The chaff of the fellow-student and the rough handling at rehearsals might be trusted to counteract the dangers of too much self-improvement.

Such a theatre might become a school alike for actors, audience, and authors. It would do much to embody and maintain the high traditions of the English stage coming down from Garrick, the Kembles, the Keans, Macready, Phelps, and Calvert, and in our own days so worthily upheld by Sir Henry Irving.

Surely there is room for such an establishment—subventioned if needs be by a syndicate or an individual, either by guarantee or subsidy—in one or more of our big cities. The time is ripe for it. It has been written about for years, and recently not only by Mr. Jones, but by Messrs. Archer, Sidney Lee, and others. Possessing the most wonderful and the most national dramatist, it is somewhat a reflection on our methods that there is but one theatre in his own country—namely, that at Stratford-on-Avon, erected chiefly by the exertions of the late Mr. Charles Flower—that is able permanently to set itself to produce his works apart from considerations of revenue.

There is no reason, however, why such an experiment should be unremunerative, given time, prudence, and wise administration. If it were desirable, it might soon become independent of subvention; only it must not try to realise all its ideals at first, but must be content from small beginnings to grow steadily and sanely.

It may not come to-day, but it will to-morrow, with spread of

libraries, swimming-baths, and picture-galleries, as part of our reawakened civic responsibility and municipal development.

When it does come, such theatre will once more become one of the centres of the nation's life, reflecting and ennobling its sorrow, its joy, its hope. In the words of Sir Philip Sidney, its chief aim will be to give to the people pleasure that shall be noble pleasure.

Its work will not be forced on the public as part of a hard-and-fast scheme of education, but it will seek rather to attract by its loveliness and truth.

Its watchword in this twentieth century will be that of King Alfred in the tenth—'Service is Power.'

FRANK R. BENSON.

RELATIONSHIP OF HOSPITALS TO MEDICAL SCHOOLS

THE article by Mr. Burford Rawlings in the last number of this Review, entitled 'Doctors in Hospitals,' commences by alluding to the friction which often occurs between the managers of these institutions and the medical staff. He then takes for his text the proposition 'that there are always two conflicting influences present, the philanthropic and the professional,' and this he more fully expounds in his essay. If he intends to place philanthropic governors on the one side and professional men on the other as opposing forces, he makes a statement which is absolutely erroneous. It is true that friction has often occurred between the two bodies, of the governors on the one hand and the medical men on the other; nevertheless, this is capable of being removed, enabling them to work smoothly together, as I shall presently show. It is, however, a fact that there are certain persons of a peculiar temperament who have a most intense hatred towards all forms of scientific thought. This antipathy seems to be inherent in the constitution and cannot be overcome. It has been truly said that men are born Platonists or Aristotelians, and when this is markedly the case this rancour is explained.

It is impossible to overlook the remark that the doctors are not actuated by the same feelings towards the public as any other class of the community. This is only asserting over again a vulgar error; it must imply much ignorance of any writer who has not heard of the Babingtons, Gregories and Alisons, all hospital doctors, and equally known as eminent philanthropists, spending their time and money amongst the poor in the lowest quarters of the cities where they lived. When I regard Mr. Rawlings' statement personally, I can state unhesitatingly—and in this many other hospital physicians will join me—that I have spent the best hours of a long life, my utmost energies and my most anxious thoughts, for the benefit of a large hospital. This has brought me, no doubt, a moderate livelihood (large incomes are the rare exceptions); but when I am told that I have done all this for sordid motives, no words would be too strong to express my indigna-

tion, but I will be content with saying that the character which the writer has given to hospital doctors is cruelly false. All his denunciations are of a like nature; many so absurd and extravagant that it would be a waste of time to dilate upon them respectively. I am sure he will find but little sympathy with the majority of hospital governors in what he has said, although he may gain some little *éclat* with a small anti-scientific clique.

The friction in the hospitals in the past has been mainly due to the fact that many governors have hitherto had only one simple object before them, one founded on a limited benevolent feeling—the welfare of the individual patient; in this the medical officers have fully sympathised, but they have realised something more: they have felt a scientific interest in the case, as it was their nature and calling to do, being eager to add to the knowledge which might be of benefit to others. They have been thankful to the governors for giving them the great and unique opportunity of doing good work in the hospitals; but if any of the staff required further instruments or means of research, a difference between them and the governors at once arose. These novelties were not in the eyes of the latter of any value to the inmates, and would involve extra expense. In this way most of the friction has occurred. In the course of years, however, many intelligent governors have seen that they ought to be on a level with the times and assist in the advancement of the knowledge which was rapidly proceeding; that laryngoscopes and ophthalmoscopes were not mere playthings, and that the discovery of bacteria in many forms of disease was not merely one of scientific interest to the doctors; consequently, that all these new methods of inquiry should be placed in the hands of the medical officers; and, more than this, some governors saw that the institute which they ruled would become of great use to others besides the inmates, and therefore they had a duty to the community at large. In this way the governors of many large hospitals have allied themselves with the medical staff, and they now live in the greatest harmony. It would be a dreadful consideration if it were impossible for this to be the case, and the philanthropic governor and the doctor to have such opposing aims that they never could work together.

The article touches upon a large number of questions relating to most important matters with respect to the duties of the medical staff and governors, as well as the true functions of a public hospital.

In looking back over the last half-century, during which time I have been associated with several institutions, I know that many of these questions have never ceased to be burning ones nearly up to the present time; but I have lived long enough to have seen most of them amicably settled; to have seen governors and the medical men join hands and now work together for the common good. There

must, indeed, be something nowadays very wrong in the administration of a hospital where the governors and medical staff are in chronic discord.

Some allusion to controversies elsewhere in which I have taken part may be of use to the public on the present occasion. These have been greatest and most accentuated in those hospitals where medical schools are attached, as they necessarily furnish more numerous points of friction between the two bodies. In former times a hospital was administered in a perfectly independent manner by its governors, and the school connected with it was allowed to exist on sufferance, or sometimes even looked upon as a necessary evil. The governors had complete control over both sides of the institution, appointing lecturers to the school as well as medical officers to the hospital. The evils of the system were formerly seen in its tendency to abuse in consequence of the administration being put into the hands of one governor or treasurer, who then acted as a despotic monarch. He made use too often of family influences and his own natural ties in the creation of doctors, chaplain, nurses, and every other subordinate. All this has now happily disappeared. It has now been generally recognised that the governors, the medical staff, and the teachers in the attached school have only one interest common to them all. I have every reason to believe that the two sides of most medical institutions are now working together in the utmost harmony. As showing how inseparably the hospital and school are united, there is never a new development of the former without its being useful to the latter; and on the contrary, which is a very striking fact, many additions which were found absolutely necessary for teaching purposes have become some of the most important adjuncts to the hospital and of the greatest service to the public. I may mention the different lying-in charities formed, in the first place, as a necessity for the student's instruction; with the same object have been introduced departments for diseases of the skin, for dental surgery, for ophthalmic surgery, and several others, all of which have turned out to be of the utmost utility to the public. There are now to be found plenty of experienced governors who will openly aver that, so far from the hospital and school having opposite aims, whatever is useful for the one has been of benefit to the other.

It will not, however, be amiss to refer to some of the points of contention which formerly occurred, as they might crop up again in some other form. Some of these were real matters of conviction, others turned upon pecuniary considerations. In former times the governors were content to administer a hospital as they would do a workhouse or an asylum, thinking only of the comforts of the inmates.

There might be a necessity for admitting students to the wards

for the sake of learning their profession, but with this the governors had no sympathy. They had scarcely reached the idea of looking at the hospital as a great teaching establishment for diffusing knowledge through the kingdom for the benefit of all, and did not recognise that their aid should be given for the promotion of this great object. They were therefore chary of spending a penny which was not directly and evidently required for the patients' benefit. And it was generally a money consideration which stirred up the merits of the question, as, for example, whether some newly invented apparatus was absolutely necessary for the benefit of the patients, or was merely of scientific interest. I well remember that the first microscope used for clinical purposes was supplied by the medical school; that is, its cost came out of the pockets of the teachers. At that time the surgeons brought their own instruments to the hospital for operations and the dressers were obliged to provide themselves with their own dressing-cases. In return these young men who looked after the patients were provided with board and lodging.

In another department with which I was intimately acquainted, I can speak from personal knowledge concerning the different views formerly held by governors and medical staff as to whose duty it was to furnish a post-mortem room for the inspection of the dead. The hospital declared that it would do no more than provide the room; it had very little need of the place, which was only useful to the medical men for scientific purposes, and therefore virtually belonged to the school. This I may mention had nothing to do with the dissecting room devoted to the teaching of anatomy, and which is usually placed far away from the hospital. At that time pathology formed no part of the curriculum laid down by the examining boards; but when it came to be more systematically taught, one of the junior officers was appointed to demonstrate the morbid structures, and this necessitated paid attendants and numerous implements, which put the school to increased expense. It might have been thought that when in those olden days the hospitals had seen such good work turned out as the discoveries by Bright and Baillie, the governors would have seen their way to take charge of this department; but it was declared that they had very little requirement for it, and that it was of use only to those who carried on pathological investigations. When it was pointed out that these examinations often revealed causes of death due to violence, the answer was that these were matters for the coroner and police. At that time, so little did the governors consider that they had any other functions than looking after the comforts of the patients that, when an inspection was made, it was done only at the special request of the surgeon or physician, who filled up a printed form stating that the case was one of great interest, and therefore he requested permission to examine the body. The superintendent then com-

municated with the friends and his request was usually granted. This was done in the sole interest of the medical man.

Not many years, however, passed before pathology came to be considered one of the most important branches of medical learning, and the lay authorities saw that they must afford more accommodation for its pursuit. Having interested myself in the subject, I was appealed to by a very active and intelligent governor of one of the largest hospitals in the East of London; as a result the assistant-physician, who was in daily attendance to superintend the autopsies, was awarded 100*l.* a year. This governor had come to see that it was a duty of the authorities to possess a more accurate and complete account of the causes of death than had ever before been possessed; but this small allowance was not given without the protest of some other governors, who maintained that it was a diversion of the money they had in trust from its rightful purpose. In another hospital at the West End of London a new arrangement was made by the hospital and school dividing the expenses of this department amongst them. It was beginning to be seen that the governors had something more devolving upon them than making the patient comfortable in his bed; that they had a large amount of material in their hands which might be used for the advancement of medical knowledge, and that this should not be allowed to run to waste.

I cannot too strongly enforce the fact upon my readers that in many cases the hospitals are the only places which can supply the information which is so much needed for the public good. Where, may I ask, could the methods of the Listerian treatment have been learned and developed but in a great hospital? The wealthy certainly found the means for supporting the hospital, but it gave them back the value sevenfold. Let me take another example of this. Sir William Jenner, when appointed to the Fever Hospital, was discontented with the term 'common continued fever,' and was determined to analyse it further. He began by taking careful notes of the cases in the wards, and if the patient died, followed the body into the post-mortem room. Here he spent months, or I might say years, in the most searching examinations of the intestinal canal and other parts, with the discovery that he was dealing probably with two very different diseases under the name of fever, one of them being the highly contagious typhus and the other typhoid or enteric. He himself, I might remark, became the victim of typhus and had a very protracted illness. This knowledge which Jenner obtained was most accurate, and laid the foundation for quite new views of the subject, which became universally adopted and utilised throughout the kingdom. It is only reasonable to suppose that this work of Jenner entailed some slight extra expense, but whether this was defrayed by the doctor or by the institution I do not know. This seems a matter of little moment in comparison with the large

and important result obtained; but on the present occasion it would be very interesting to discover the facts. Judging from opinions which now prevail, it may be assumed that there were those amongst the governors who felt proud that the hospital over which they presided was bearing such good fruit for the benefit of mankind, whilst no doubt there were others who protested against the smallest sum being expended for so-called scientific purposes. However this may be, it is evident that no such investigation could have been carried on in private houses, to say nothing of the advantage of having a number of cases of the same kind brought together in one place, and therefore we all ought to feel a debt of gratitude to the governors for allowing Sir W. Jenner to make these researches. Let us hope that some of the present governors feel a reflected glory when they enter the building, and that a glow of satisfaction comes over them when feeling that they themselves might participate in a similar undertaking. It is impossible to suppose that there are not many amongst the governors of the Queen Square Hospital who have not the same feeling of pride when they consider they are attached to an institution which the medical officers have made one of world-wide renown.

Some years ago a very fatal malady was observed at Bradford, which soon began to be known as the Woolsorter's Disease. This was due to blood-poisoning owing to the introduction of a parasite attached to the foreign skins. About the same time there appeared a fatal form of boil amongst the tanners or fellmongers at Bermondsey. When these cases went to a neighbouring hospital they underwent a rigid examination in the medical school laboratory, with the result that they were found to be due to a parasite of the same nature as was met with in the Woolsorter's Disease. This suggested the appropriate remedies and external treatment, resulting in the cure of most subsequent cases. I believe the hospital incurred no expense on account of this necessary investigation. It would be interesting to know how any hospital would act under like circumstances if no medical school had been attached.

I must also add that the ordinary pathological work of the hospital, which is only partly paid for by the governors, brings with it often an amount of information which nowhere else could be obtained. A very loathsome disease, which already had received the notice of the British Government owing to its ravages in India and elsewhere, has many victims dying in the London hospitals. This disease became a few years ago the subject of a much more intimate examination than had ever been undertaken before, when it was found that various parts of the interior of the body were affected as well as those of the exterior. The external manifestations had been known for centuries, but, from the absence of a thorough post-mortem examination, the extent of the mischief on the internal organs of the body was unknown, notably the damage to the brain

and the liver. Associated with the changes found in these organs there had been present hepatic and cerebral affections, such as epilepsy and paralysis. This discovery suggested the same remedies for these disorders as had been found most efficient in the more commonly recognised symptoms, and their use was followed by the most astonishing result. Patients with the severest forms of epilepsy were now cured; those lying hopelessly ill with paralysis were raised from a bed of apparent death, and many a man with supposed cancer of the liver was absolutely cured. All this immensity of good has come out of a careful examination of those who had died of these loathsome diseases. This could only have been effected by seizing the opportunities which the hospitals offer.

With such flagrant instances before them it seems extraordinary to find some governors of hospitals declare that, although these institutions are the only places where it is possible for this most important knowledge to be obtained, they have no concern in the matter, and are opposed to the outlay of a farthing of the funds, which ought to be devoted solely for the care and comforts of the individual patient. They say that they have no public responsibility beyond this. I apprehend that in cases of death from suspected poisoning, where there was no professor to undertake an analysis, the governors would be within their rights to throw the responsibility upon the police or other external authorities.

As at the present time means are being adopted by an anti-scientific clique to put a stop to all physiological and pathological inquiry, by making more stringent the laws which already control research, I may take this opportunity of informing my readers, as few are acquainted with the fact, that the complete study of anatomy is also hampered by Acts of Parliament. If England were isolated and had no connection with the Continent it would be impossible for the medical student to learn his profession. The provisions of the Anatomy Act, which has worked well as a whole, require that no body can be dissected unless by the sanction of the Government inspector, and also that it must be buried in a public cemetery at the end of a month or thereabouts; this is also certified by the inspector and the returns are sent to the Secretary of State. In consequence of this enactment it is impossible to take away all the bones in order to frame a skeleton. Consequently no skeleton has been made in this country for many years. Those found in our museums are either old or have been imported from abroad. As the first lesson the student has to take is in osteology, it is necessary for the museum to be provided with skeletons and separate bones; consequently they have to be brought from abroad. It was my duty for several years to pay a heavy annual bill to a person who traded in such articles in Paris. It is satisfactory to know that there is no marked difference between the bones of French men and women and those of our own

countrymen, and therefore no fear of any ill arising from this restrictive Act.

I cannot, however, refrain from remarking that the position our country takes in the progress of the arts and sciences requires our most serious consideration. We are constantly hearing of our inferiority in manufactures and in artistic articles; we therefore require rather official support than the introduction of any measures which might retard their progress. In this light it is serious to contemplate the possibility of any further legislative enactment to retard the study of anatomy and physiology, already hampered by two distinct Acts of Parliament preventing their full development and practical efficiency.

SAMUEL WILKS.

ASTRONOMICAL LABORATORIES

THE grandest problems of astronomy have ever been problems of measurement. Descriptive observation may give us a picture of our solar system, and tell something of the apparent system of the stars. But purely descriptive astronomy knows nothing of absolute size and distance; it can furnish no predictions of the places of the heavenly bodies for the use of the navigator and the surveyor, no data by which to test and ultimately to justify the dynamical theories of the celestial motions. Such matters lie entirely within the scope of the astronomy of measurement.

Alike for their practical bearing and their grander interest these problems of measurement claim to-day by far the larger share of the astronomer's efforts. But they demand for their solution powerful and costly instruments; and, as refinement after refinement has been added to the telescopes to meet the demand for higher accuracy, the work has fallen more and more into the hands of the great public observatories. Modest instruments cannot improve our knowledge of the distance of the sun and stars, nor lay down the positions of the stars in those great clusters which may show in the future evidence of cosmical change. While there are a hundred such paths of investigation lying open to the fortunate possessors of powerful telescopes, institutions and individuals more humbly equipped are forced to confine their efforts to certain narrow fields of activity.

And so long as the measurements are made at the telescope itself, by visual observation, progress is comparatively slow. Yet it should be remarked that the mass of figures which an observer accumulates in a night's measuring at the telescope is frequently more than he can deal with single-handed on succeeding days. Before the complete result is obtained the measures must be corrected for many determined sources of error, and there are long calculations to be performed. But with a moderate amount of assistance in the more mechanical parts of the calculation it has generally been possible to keep pace with the observations, and the time spent in the after processes bears a just proportion to the time spent at the telescope.

These conditions have been profoundly modified by the recent application of photographic methods to astronomical measurement. Let us consider, for example, the old and the new methods of surveying a cluster of stars. Of old the measuring apparatus was applied to the telescope, and the astronomer laboriously measured the distance from star to star until the whole group was triangulated. Frequently it was a matter of assiduous labour on every fine night for many months, during the whole of which time the telescope was fully occupied. Nowadays the measuring apparatus is removed from the telescope, and a photographic plate is placed in its stead. In a few minutes every star has left its mark upon the sensitive film; the plate is removed for development, and the work of the telescope is finished.

By the application of photographic methods the output of the telescope can thus be increased a hundred-fold. The time spent in laborious measurement upon the stars themselves has been saved for the nonce, and in a single night the telescope can record the positions of field after field of stars. It is not producing the measures themselves, but the raw material for after-measurement. The photographs which are amassed in such profusion must each be placed under a microscope, and the distance measured from image to image of the stars. The work is not so exacting as direct measurement at the telescope, for it can be pursued in the comfort of the library and in despite of cloudy skies. But still it is a long process, and there remains afterwards an amount of calculation to be carried through at least comparable with that which was required in the old days of visual observation.

The position of an observatory equipped with a photographic telescope is therefore briefly this—that the power of the instrument to produce raw material is increased a hundred-fold, and the work to be done for every star after the telescope has dealt with it is perhaps doubled, because there is added to the calculation the work of measurement, which was formerly done at the telescope itself. But it is utterly impossible to multiply many fold the computing forces of the observatory, to enable them to deal with the vast output of a photographic telescope in continuous work. There is no longer a just proportion between the time spent in the computing room and the time spent at the telescope, and the only possible course is to limit the use of the instrument to a few nights in the year, or to employ it in producing pictures which are not intended for subsequent accurate measurement.

Now this difficulty, which is so embarrassing to the well-found but often under-manned observatories, is a golden opportunity for those who desire to do astronomical work of the highest refinement, but have only modest means. The photographic telescopes that are at work can produce far more material in the shape of plates than can

possibly be dealt with by the regular staffs of the observatories. They must call in help from without to aid in the labour of measurement and reduction of these photographic observations. And there should be no difficulty in securing this help when once it is realised how urgent is the call and how practicable the response. The sum which will buy the apparatus for measuring star photographs is small compared with the cost of equipping a very modest observatory. For a hundred pounds the college which desires to found a school of practical astronomy, or the amateur who is anxious to spend his leisure hours in work of true scientific value, can be placed on terms of equality with the most magnificent observatory in the world, in everything but the power of producing the star photographs on which to work. Nor need there be any fear that these would not be forthcoming. There are already available tens of thousands of photographs accumulated in the first pride of possession of a photographic telescope, ere it was realised that the work of utilisation could not keep pace with the powers of production. And there are many directors of observatories who have found themselves, to their keen regret, forced to limit the output of their splendid instruments, and who would rejoice over any increase in the power required to deal with the problems which could be attacked by photography, if only there were workers enough to carry on the work after the telescope had done its part.

There is nothing visionary in this estimate of the opportunities which photography has placed within the reach of would-be astronomers. Work of the highest value has already been accomplished precisely on these lines. Some years ago the Professor of Astronomy at the Dutch University of Groningen found himself with ample time for original work; but there was no observatory, and no money to build one. At the same time the Astronomer Royal at the Cape was completing a photographic survey of the southern sky, but the staff of his observatory was not large enough to enable him to measure the star pictures as they were obtained. The Dutch professor proposed to the astronomer at the Cape that the photographic plates as they were taken should be sent to Groningen, and that he should devote some years of his life to measuring the positions of the stars upon them, and preparing the catalogue of star-places which would result. The offer was accepted with enthusiasm; the plates were sent; and as a result there has recently appeared a catalogue of the positions of several hundred thousand southern stars, complementing the classic work which Argelander accomplished many years ago by direct observation for the northern sky. At first the professor worked at home. More recently he has obtained the use of a room in the physical laboratory of the university; a second measuring machine has been set up there; one or two students have joined in the work, and a beginning has been made of a wholesale determination of the distances of the stars, from plates which were taken

especially for them by the director of the Observatory of Helsingfors. Such are the beginnings of the astronomical laboratory of Groningen. To its eminent director belongs the credit of being the first to build up a school of practical astronomy and a true observatory of first-rate power in a university which possesses no observatory in the hitherto accepted sense of the term.

And at least two enthusiastic amateurs have set up for themselves private astronomical laboratories, if we may use this very convenient name to distinguish them from observatories of the familiar type. The mathematical master at an English public school is engaged in determining the positions of formations on the surface of the moon from photographs lent by the Paris Observatory. And there is a gardener in the North of England who spends his evenings measuring the positions of stars on plates taken at the Oxford University Observatory for the catalogue of the great photographic chart of the heavens.

It cannot be too strongly urged that the only hope of utilising the vastly increased powers which photography has given to astronomers lies in the multiplication of these astronomical laboratories. The work is pleasant; it can be pursued without any of the discomforts which attend working at a telescope in the cold and the dark; and it can be carried on regularly in despite of cloudy skies, which is a point whose importance can be realised only by those who have tried to work with a telescope during the past winter. There are many men who devote their leisure to astronomy and who have built for themselves small observatories. Not infrequently they have been keenly disappointed to realise that with their small opportunities they cannot add much to the sum of accurate knowledge, and they have grown tired of mere star-gazing. To such men photography has thrown open a field of boundless opportunity. If they are content to set up a measuring machine instead of a telescope, and to measure the star photographs which have been made at the great observatories, there is no limit to the aid which they can render to the progress of astronomy.

Let us take the case of a particular problem which is just now engaging the attention of astronomers all over the world. During the past winter the newly discovered planet Eros has come very near the earth. A great combined effort has been made to determine the distance of the planet. To this end thousands of photographs have been obtained recording the position of Eros among the surrounding stars. When they are completely measured and discussed we shall be in a position to deduce with great accuracy the distance of the planet, and that will lead to an improvement in our knowledge of the distance of the sun from the earth, a distance which is of paramount interest, because it is the unit in which all other astronomical distances are expressed. But there is the ever-present difficulty to

be surmounted. Far more photographs have been obtained than can be measured in a reasonable number of years by the astronomers who took them, even if they could afford to lay aside the photographic survey of the heavens on which they were before engaged, and to let their telescopes stand idle, producing no more results. There is fear that the new solution of the grandest problem in astronomy will be indefinitely delayed, and there can be no attack upon a hundred other problems which are pressing for solution, until it is realised by those who are in a position to help, that under the altered conditions introduced by the application of photography to astronomical measurement the necessary complement of each observatory equipped with a photographic telescope is a score of observatories of the new type, the astronomical laboratories.

ARTHUR R. HINKS.

THE HOUSING PROBLEM

GOOD times have not solved the housing problem. Trade is abundant and wages high, but the complaint of want of 'room to live' which rose in 1851, in 1875, and 1884 still rises. Facts disgraceful to civilisation continue to be brought to light. The neighbours of people who live in mansions suffer from want of space and air; the strength of a nation which takes upon itself Imperial burdens is wasted by the disease and the immorality which follow on overcrowding.

No one will suspect a Whitechapel parson of a desire to disregard the suffering of the poor, or of a disposition to use smooth language towards their oppressors. The emotions of pity and of anger which have loud utterance are fully justified, but it is a question, whether such emotions have not had sufficient utterance, whether indeed force is not used in screaming which is wanted for action, whether there has not been enough of tales of slum life, enough pictures of squalor, enough of declamation by Cabinet ministers, missionaries, and reformers. The walls of Jericho do not always fall at the sound of trumpets, and shouting often makes a bad atmosphere in which to decide on action. Legislation in a passion, like diplomacy in a passion, has sometimes disastrous issues. It will be well, therefore, that feelings which have been roused by tales of family life in one room, of children dying for want of air, of drunkenness, and poverty, and immorality which haunt houses unfit for habitation—it will be well that feelings so aroused be dipped in the waters of calm reflection. Other facts will then come into prominence, and action may proceed more surely. Among such facts are the following:—

(1) The presence of forces which are diminishing the evil. It is commonly said that there has been no result from past agitation. There has indeed been no heroic result, no measure sweeping away slums and establishing cheap and healthy dwellings. But heroic measures in these days of war are justly suspect; for war itself is an example of an heroic remedy, and its dangers as a remedy are manifest. The Royal Commission on Housing brought about no direct change, but it gave impulse and direction to forces which have been quietly working towards improvement:

During the last twenty years local authorities have been becoming more active; a higher standard of order has been enforced, and thousands of houses have been made more healthy. In 1885 there were only 89 sanitary inspectors employed by the London authorities; in 1898 there were 256 so employed.

During the same period great suburbs have grown up outside the crowded centres of population, and now flourishing townships with their own town-halls, their theatres, their bus service, and their embryo civic sense exist and grow.

In 1899 there were 27,381 houses built within the metropolitan police district, and no one familiar with the growth of places like Tottenham, Edmonton, or Willesden needs figures to prove that the working population is housing itself in convenient houses where flowers will grow and from which the fields may be reached.

Many industries have at the same time been removed to a greater distance, and now a factory with its group of workmen's cottages often breaks on a traveller's sight as a new feature from a railway-carriage window.

All the time education has been raising the standard of knowledge and of taste. There is therefore a large demand for wider accommodation and more enterprise to go farther in its search. People who had been content with two rooms feel the need of three, and workmen who have had to travel from the East End to work in all parts of London find that it is no greater hardship to travel from a more distant suburb.

Statistics show that the number of people in the central area or London has been diminishing at a progressive rate since 1861, the rate of diminution for the successive decades being 2.7, 4.6, and 7.2 per cent. Business men, therefore, with an intelligent appreciation of the future, are not inclined to make permanent investments in dwelling-house property in town centres.

It may be that, for the moment, because good times have happened to coincide with the demolition of houses, the demand for them has outrun the supply, and that the pressure is producing exceptional overcrowding and suffering. It may be that people have not yet accommodated themselves to the new conditions, and therefore cling to districts from which they ought to remove—a transition period is always a period in which many endure hardship. But the fact remains that the same forces which increase overcrowding are also providing the remedy. It is the prosperity and progress in which all share which substitute warehouses and offices for dwellings. It is prosperity and progress which bring people together, and create the desire for more room. It is prosperity and progress which have almost doubled the cost of building, so that a room which ten years ago cost 70*l.* now costs 108*l.* It is also prosperity and progress which war against unhealthy houses, make the people more willing and able to move to the suburbs, and

raise the supply of accommodation. The evil may still run strongly, but the hounds of reform are in full cry.

(2) Another fact which stands out, as passion is dipped in reflection, is that there is a class of people who refuse to live within the restraint of decent houses. When well-built single rooms were offered in Whitechapel at eighteenpence a week, the people of the so-called lowest class preferred to pay four and sixpence in squalid houses where there was no porter to require cleanly habits, and no public opinion in favour of regular ways. The 'very poor,' as they are called, are not the people whose income is the smallest. The ragged and the wretched have often more to spend than the steady and decent labourer or widow. It may be because of neglect in their youth, it may be because they are feeble-minded, it may be because their disposition is for change and for excitement; but the fact remains that many men and women like the streets, cherish the freedom of being dirty, and choose to live in a crowd. The number of such people may not be large in proportion to the population, but they loom large in observers' eyes. Their wretchedness, their poverty, their frequent untimely deaths, their vices, attract the pens of writers and provoke the action of philanthropists and legislators.

Far be it from me to say that such people are beyond cure. Their children might be brought under discriminating guardianship; the young might be separated from their associations and taught to enjoy work; the more hardened or the most enfeebled might be kept in restraint; one and all might be brought within the healing and strengthening influence of personal care. The existence of such people may be in a large measure due to the 'bad housing' of their parents; but they are not to be helped simply by the provision of better houses, and the opinion so often expressed, that it is necessary to do so, only confuses the housing problem.

The action taken in pity for these people, the attempt at much cost to re-house decently those who have been removed from their slums, both fails in its object and makes other provision more difficult. How often when a public body is considering the removal of a slum some advocate of the poor speaks about the necessity of 'housing the same class of people'! His appeal either ends in nothing being done, or in using the rates to offer very low rents. If the latter course is followed, the new houses are occupied by the thrifty, and another example is offered which an orator of the future may quote as an instance of the way the 'very poor' have been neglected in previous schemes.

The best thing which public or common action can do for a slum is to break it up—to treat the inhabitants as the police treat loafers, make them move on; to do as housewives do in a dusty room, remove the dust to another place. Dirt is good matter in a wrong place, and there are always some young people or men and women in slums

who are useless because of their surroundings. When a slum neighbourhood is broken up such characters escape from their evil associations and have a chance to settle down where they may, and often do, become useful to society; the others who go on in their bad ways are not more out of reach, indeed they are often more within reach of the personal influence which best can help them.

Reformers who set themselves to solve the housing problem must not expect to cure all the ills of society; they can only co-operate with other agencies. They cannot do what it is reserved for personal force to do. They must not therefore think too much of the class about whom most is written, or limit their powers while they try to suit rents and accommodation to the needs of people who, until they are educated, will not endure decent lodging. 'A pig,' it has been said, 'does not become a gentleman by being put in a drawing-room.'

The cost—as Miss Octavia Hill would tell us—of fitting some people to use good houses is greater than that which can be met by grants out of the rates or well-administered building schemes. 'I am deeply convinced,' says Mr. H. Fyfe—chief sanitary inspector of Glasgow, 'that no power that can be brought to bear on the health of the common people is to be compared with the power of the loving, personal interest of a man or woman who knows their weaknesses and their legitimate wants.' And the Glasgow Corporation, acting on this conviction, has appointed six female inspectors who, by words of sympathy and small acts of kindness, win the people to better ways. There is much to be done for the lowest class by education, by the Poor Law, and by personal service; but to consider this class as the first object of improved housing is to let feeling blind reason.

(3) Another fact which becomes clear on reflection is that the need of a workman to live near his work is less and less pressing. The eastern districts, for instance, which are occupied by two millions of people belonging chiefly to the working classes, are not mainly centres of industry. Working men and women may be met morning and evening on their way to the north, south, and west. The provision by the Great Eastern Railway of shilling weekly tickets to places as distant as Enfield, and not the existence of factories, accounts for the population of these districts. If other railways had made the same provisions, if electric tramcars were running by the great northern and western roads, workmen could as conveniently live in the west as in the east. There must indeed be provision nearer the centre for men and women who attend the markets or, as at the docks, work at irregular intervals; but the all-night service of trains and trams already meets the needs of many such workers; and for those who are bound to remain, the present provision is probably sufficient.

(4) The last fact which I would submit to reformers excited by the action of owners who raise rents and evict tenants or run up houses

for occupation, is that these 'house jobbers,' these 'house sweaters,' these 'jerrybuilders,' are only speculators using within the limits of law and public opinion the foresight and the energy which make the wealth of the nation. There are, undoubtedly, individuals who behave as tyrants or rogues where public opinion is weak, and there are others who break laws which are feebly administered; but the greater number act on exactly the same lines as other citizens who buy and sell to increase their fortunes. They are the makers of the wealth which is necessary for improvements. They are no worse and no better than other enterprising business men—just as well-intentioned and just as self-seeking.

Small house property is indeed the favourite investment of honest and self-respecting workmen; and many men who twenty years ago began to save their money, are now landlords, drawing their income—as the great of the land draw theirs—from their property. The majority do their duty to their tenants, but there are some who oppress and cheat them; though these latter are more and more condemned by public opinion or held up by the law.

In the same way the so-called 'jerrybuilders' are often builders who, working with their own hands, work cheaply. The houses they build are generally well planned and sufficiently strong. The tendency to build without proper precautions against damp or disease is being more and more checked by the action of inspectors or public authorities; and there are now thousands and thousands of happy and healthy households who rejoice in the occupation, often in the possession, of the little house and garden which have been brought within their reach by the enterprise of small builders. The ugliness of the modern suburb is not the fault of the builders; ugliness is not yet recognised as a national loss. That too will be corrected when taste improves, and when taste is represented on the local authority.

The housing problem rouses, and rightly rouses, the passions of pity and indignation. It is hard to be still when statistics show that where housing is bad the death-rate is double, the poverty irremediable, and degradation hopeless. The nation is rich, and the people perish for want of house-room. There is no language too strong to express the feelings of those who have seen with their eyes how the poor live; but they who feel most deeply must allow that reflection shows forces at work for the remedy of the evil. The public spirit which works through Councils for the establishment of health is more active. The developments of trade tend to scatter the population. The enterprise of individuals is shown both in the provision of houses and in the will to seek homes farther afield. By the action of such forces there has been improvement; the obvious thing to do is to make the way free for the further action of the same forces. The best doctor is the one who works with nature.

PROPOSED WAYS OF PROCEEDING

(1) Public spirit has shown itself in the action of the Councils. Public spirit would do more if the Councils were more enlightened. The ratepayers would endure taxation if they were assured that their neighbours would benefit. There is the will to help if the Councils could show the way. The immediate necessity is more thoughtful, more educated, and more sympathetic local governors. A Council strong in knowledge, whose members were intelligent and familiar with others' needs, would wisely enforce the laws against insanitary property, and gradually raise the standard of cleanliness, warmth, and ventilation; it would prevent unfit building, and at the same time relax some of the pedantic regulations which hinder fit building (these regulations, in theory admirable, in practice unnecessary, often involve much delay and expense); it would spend freely on objects which directly or indirectly spread joys in widest commonality; it would support and restrain its officials; it could without any new law, by wise administration of the existing laws, do away with much of the present trouble.

The Councils of to-day are better than the Councils of ten years ago, but the Councils of ten years hence should be much better than those of to-day. Men and women must bring to that service the advantages they have gained by wealth or study. They must be willing to sacrifice their leisure and give up their late dinners so as to take part in local affairs. The candidates for a Council must be in every sense the best people, desiring no favour and fearing no enmity, daring to raise their neighbours' assessment or dismiss an official. There is at the present moment no such honour obtainable as that to be won in municipal service. It is an honour to be won by the courage to stand the fire of criticism and the opposition of ignorance, and it has for its reward the happiness of the people.

Better local authorities must exist before the settlement of the housing problem is possible; and more public spirit, more readiness on the part of people of character, knowledge, and position, to offer themselves for election and endure the weariness of committees, must exist before better local authorities are possible.

(2) The other force at present working towards a remedy is the private enterprise which has been developed by prosperity and education. It may sometimes need restraint, but its constant need is space. A good Council may exercise such restraint, prevent the tyranny of the strong or the scamping of work by the weak; but there must be some change of law to give enterprise the necessary space for activity. Private enterprise is at present limited for want of land and for want of facilities of communication. It suffers because of previous public neglect.

If builders could get land on which it would pay to build, they

would set to work to-morrow. There are many ways in which land could be brought within their reach :

(i.) The owners of condemned property might be given only such a price as would admit of the land being let or sold to builders at a rate which would allow them to build habitable houses at a fair profit. A butcher who sells bad meat gets no compensation when it is condemned ; a landlord whose houses are so bad as to be unfit for habitation need have no claim for compensation beyond the bare value of the land as a building site for workmen's dwellings.¹

(ii.) All vacant land within the area of the borough or township, and land within a certain area outside its limits, might be rated. A further suggestion is sometimes added that the community, even Parish Councils, should have the right to purchase such land at the rateable value. If this were adopted there would always be land which could be let or sold to builders ; but even without this power of compulsory purchase the rating of vacant lands and another system of rating would have great effect. To quote Mr. Young, valuer to the London County Council : ' According,' he says, ' to the present system, the burden of taxation tends to fall on the property taxed rather than upon the occupier. No one will build till the value of the site is able to bear the burden of taxation. . . . The effect of this on the provision of house accommodation can hardly be over-estimated.' Mr. Wallace-Bruce, the ex-Chairman of the Housing Committee, puts the same argument in another way : ' If central rates could be removed from buildings and land to land only, so that the value of the land only should be taxed with rates, it would greatly assist building on cheap land. In the outskirts the house is, say, six times the value of the land, and rates are therefore a tax on the building industry, which impedes building ; near the centre, land is six times the value of the house, and should pay central rates for improvement accordingly.'

Mr. Young and Mr. Wallace-Bruce argue as experts, but a plain man can at once see how largely the incidence of rates affects building operations. There is land now burdened by slums ; there is vacant land within every city or borough boundary ; there are acres of land on the outskirts. All this land is ripening for the owners' benefit, who in a few years will reap the fruit of others' industry. It ought not to be impossible to throw this land on the market for builders to buy, or, better, to rent in perpetuity on renewable leases.

Builders are waiting to build houses for people waiting to occupy them. An enlightened Council, having control of land, could create villages such as that Mr. Cadbury has lately created at Bourneville. It could, for instance, preserve the trees and natural beauty ; it could

¹ The price might be fixed at a public auction, at which the land being cleared of buildings should be offered ear-marked for the erection of industrial dwellings. The price so offered should represent the amount to be paid as compensation to the owner.

preserve open spaces, give room about each house, and break up the monotony of the long straight trenches in which builders, for want of land and imagination, are now accustomed to build. An enlightened Council having land at its disposal could give liberty for the taste and energy of the builders, while it controlled the avarice which would put in bad work or bad materials.

Want of land is one limit on private enterprise, another is the want of facilities of communication. Owners cannot put their land on the market, and so, by increasing the supply, reduce the price of land; builders cannot use their capital and skill in building; workpeople cannot move to the outskirts because means of access are insufficient or non-existent. The provision of such means is certainly not beyond the resources of English intelligence or wealth. The railways, in return for their monopoly, might be required to do more. The Chairman of the Artisans Dwellings Company tells how his Company forced the railway to reduce the third-class return fare of 10*d.* to Noel Park; and what a private company has done public bodies might accomplish. Every railway out of a great town might be required to run cheap trains to suburban districts. Tramways might be much extended, or, as in America, laid down in anticipation of a population. Good direct roads might be kept open for the use of motors and buses.

The housing problem cannot, it is often said, be solved by private action. This is true, because private action has been limited by public action, and public action is necessary to break down those limits. Only a public authority can increase facilities of communication, and that public body which is most earnest in cheapening, hastening, and opening the means of travelling is doing the most for the housing of the people.

The objection is sometimes urged that improved communication benefits the landowner. To this there are two answers. The first is that if sufficient and various means of communication are opened, there will be so much land thrown at the same time on the market that competition will settle the price. The second is that possibly the public authority might have the right to purchase land at its rateable value. At any rate, a wise system of communications extending in every direction from the centre would break up the population, and possibly also prevent that settlement of classes—the rich in one suburb and the poor in another—which is so fatal to the development of a civic or national sense. Mr. C. Booth, in a pamphlet lately issued, brings all the weight of his knowledge to recommend the improvement of the means of locomotion as the one solution of the housing problem. In his own words, he urges, (1) that, with improved means of communication, the evils (connected with present overcrowding) become capable of cure; (2) that without them all other proposals would be impracticable or ineffective, and consequently that improved locomotion is the first, even if not the only thing needful.

MUNICIPAL BUILDING

But someone will object: 'There is no time to open up communications; the people die while public opinion grows. Something must be done at once.'

The objection is natural. Human nature would not be itself if it did not feel passionate because of the evil and sorrows which come of overcrowding. The rapid remedy is thus popular, and municipalities are more and more pressed to undertake the building of houses. The difficulty of expense is disregarded; and when at a Council meeting it is reported that some thousands of pounds have been written off so that rooms may be let at three shillings a week, someone asks, 'Why not write off more, so that they may be let at two shillings?' A property lately bought by the London Council, on which to build houses for the people, will cost the ratepayers 600*l.* a family, and in previous operations every person displaced has cost 50*l.* The expense would, of course, put a limit on operations. But there are other difficulties than that of expense which are bound up with municipal building. (1) The occupants of such buildings would form a privileged class, inhabiting houses at a lower rent or of superior accommodation to these which can be provided by private persons or companies. (2) Municipal bodies are not always economical administrators. They find it hard to discharge incompetent agents; there is a necessarily wooden element in their system which prevents ready adaptation to changing needs; and there is a constant tendency for expenses to rise. They may therefore have to call on the community, the majority of whom live in houses which pay their way, to bear some of the cost of houses inhabited by a small minority. (3) Another difficulty is the creation of a body of voters living in close contact and able to act together, who might control the election of the local candidate for the Council. They would be tempted to put their interests as tenants before the common interests of the neighbourhood. 'Lower rents' would not be an elevating election cry, and, if it became common, would utterly demoralise local government. (4) There is also the possible check to private enterprise which might follow, and is already said to have followed, the appearance of a competitor drawing on the public rates and depending on the public credit. (5) Municipal building, lastly, plays into the hands of the landholders by becoming another rich competitor for the acquisition of their possessions.

Municipal building has undoubtedly met some needs, and some municipal bodies have, by their public spirit and by the devotion of some of their members, shown themselves fitted for the work; but on the whole I am disposed to think that municipal building is a mistake. The large housing scheme just undertaken by the London Council is probably justified under the pressure of the present opinion, but the probable cost, the necessary delay in its completion, and the

narrow margin within which it is expected to return only 3 per cent. do not encourage the hope that the Council will be large purveyors of houses. The committee and the officials have put in long and devoted work, 29,000*l.* are to be advanced out of the rates, 1,615,000*l.* are to be borrowed, and at the end of some eight or ten years 33,000 persons will be housed. The small builders in one year house four times as many. The scheme is an experiment which will be educational.

But the ready remedy is rarely the best remedy; it too often gambles with the future, spending to-day the resources which will be wanted for to-morrow. What will be the advantage if a few thousand persons are at once housed, if hereafter discontent is encouraged, if the community is burdened with non-paying house property, or if an enlightened policy is burdened by the self-interest of the tenants? What will be the advantage if by the use of a powerful drug the wretchedness of the houseless is removed, and at the same time the natural forces at work against such wretchedness be weakened? There is so much more than houses which is necessary for the houseless, and the chief thing is to keep active that sympathy, that enterprise, and that devotion which are ready to look after all needs.

The truth is that municipal building is too easy and too cheap a remedy. The evil is too great to be met by a vote of millions of money. The neglect of individuals, the apathy of public opinion through many years, can only be made up by the activity of individuals and the lively interest of public opinion.

There are, as I have said, some definite things to be done, some changes in the law to be made; but the chief thing wanted is the individual consciousness of duty. A restless anxiety to be doing something or pity for the sorrows of others is not enough. A thought, an idea, a belief in order—in, to use the old phrase, the Kingdom of Heaven—is the only inspiration which makes action continuous and helpful. When this individual and that individual believe that health and happiness are possible in a city for all the citizens; when they recognise in the lowest not a poor creature to be pitied, but a citizen whose service of body, soul, and mind is wanted, they will work in a different way to make the city as it is more like the city as they see it ought to be.

This may seem an unpractical conclusion to a paper on the housing problem; but it has been my privilege to be engaged in practical measures for help of the poor during the last thirty years, and at the end my conclusion is that practice fails for want of knowledge and of faith. The housing problem cannot be solved by itself; it is bound up with the industrial problem, with the education problem, with the social problem, and with the religious problem. When each individual or more individuals take pains to get knowledge—to know their neighbours, to know their condition, to know what is

good and what is evil—and when each and every one takes trouble to find out what it is they believe, what about the present and what about the future, then the community will certainly find a guidance to action safer than that which any reformers or politicians can give.

SAMUEL A. BARNETT.

THE NOVELS OF ANTHONY TROLLOPE

LORD BEACONSFIELD was the Paul Veronese of English Novelists. It would be waste of time to inquire what artist's name could be bracketed with Anthony Trollope, for Mr. Trollope was not an artist, he was a photographer. It was only for the improvement of his style that he subjected himself to discipline. In this he persevered until he developed a narrative style which, for his purpose, could hardly be surpassed: it is lucid and easy, if somewhat commonplace. For the rest of an artist's work Trollope cared nothing. He did not devise new and startling plots, life as he knew it being sufficiently varied and interesting to satisfy ordinary people. He took pride in remaining an ordinary person himself, and in appealing to everyday emotion and narrating everyday experiences. What he saw he could tell better, perhaps, than anybody else, as Mr. Browning somewhat grudgingly said of Andrea del Sarto. What he did not see, did not exist for him. He had something of the angry impatience of the middle-class mind with all points of view not his own. In *Barchester Towers* he permitted himself to gibe at the recently published novel *Tancred*, and for the author as well as the work he cherished a feeling of contemptuous dislike. There could be no finer tribute to Lord Beaconsfield's genius. *Tancred* is as far beyond anything that Mr. Trollope wrote as *Orley Farm* is superior to a Chancery pleading; and we have but to lay *Alroy* on the same table with *The Prime Minister* to see where Anthony Trollope stands.

It is nearly twenty years since he died, and his work has been going steadily out of fashion every year. It is instructive to consider what kind of work has taken its place. The regrettable outpourings that well-educated people are contented to accept as literature, and to admit to their drawing-rooms, are, after all, a sorry substitute for *Orley Farm* and *Dr. Wortle's School*. But inasmuch as his work is, for the present generation of readers, dead, it may be well to recall shortly the well-filled life and varied labours of the most popular novelist of the nineteenth century.

His life was not long: he died in 1882, at the age of sixty-seven. But to have produced for thirty-five years a novel a year, to have

hunted with English and Irish packs for the greater part of that time, to have negotiated postal arrangements with Egypt, the West Indies, and the United States, to have led an admirable domestic life, and to have been welcomed in many clubs, is the record of a life of remarkable vigour and geniality. To say that he could tell what he saw is not to say much when we are speaking of ordinary men. But Trollope's life was exceptionally full, and his powers of observation equally exceptional. If all this be true, it may well be asked, Why is such good work neglected? The answer is, It is not that the work is bad: it is because the world in which Trollope lived has passed away. Witness this comment from *He Knew he was Right*:

The Foreign Office is always very civil to its next-door neighbour of the Colonies—civil and cordial, though perhaps a little patronising. A Minister is a bigger man than a Governor; and the smallest of the diplomatic fry are greater swells than even secretaries in quite important dependencies. The attaché, though he be unpaid, dwells in a capital and flirts with a countess. The Governor's right-hand man is confined to an island and dances with a planter's daughter. The distinction is quite understood, but is not incompatible with much excellent good feeling on the part of the superior Department.

To those who remember the Sleepy Hollow of Downing Street twenty years ago, this passage is not extravagant: as a description of the Colonial Office of to-day it has no relation to the facts. And this reflection brings us to the point of considering how far it is true that Mr. Trollope's world has passed away. The question is important; for the answer may explain the artificial air pervading all of this novelist's work. It is not that Trollope saw inaccurately, for his contemporaries—Nathaniel Hawthorne, for example—looked upon him as an impeccable realist. To what, then, are we to ascribe the altered views that are held to-day? Perhaps to the change of public taste which gives a French novelist (with rare exception) a life of hardly more than ten years. But more, perhaps, to the changed circumstances in which we live. The institutions to which we are accustomed are in Mr. Trollope's books, and yet they are not: for this very reason his writing is of value to the student of history, social or political.

All Mr. Trollope's characters live under the domination of four leading ideas: the supremacy of the House of Commons in the government of this country, the authority of the Press, the grip of the Church on the life of the nation, and the prestige of the marriage tie. To take these points in order: a reader under five-and-twenty years of age who takes up Mr. Trollope's novels finds in them little that he is accustomed to when considering the government of his country. Mr. Trollope's young men enter Parliament, or endeavour to do so, with the idea that they are aiming at the noblest position to which an Englishman can aspire, a position where they will be called upon to discharge important duties. There have

been many important things done by this country during the last twenty years: the redemption of Egypt, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the conquest of Burmah, the British East Africa Company, Zanzibar, Nigeria, Rhodesia: but the House of Commons has had nothing to do with all this. These are the events which stir the imagination of a great people, which affect their political and material interests, and which affect that far higher interest—the national character—through the consciousness of fine work finely done. But the functions of the House of Commons have in these cases been confined to registering or protesting against the work of the men of action. In effect, since 1882 we have lived, for the first time in our history, under Bacon's ideal system of government, consisting of an all-wise Sovereign, consulting with the pick of her subjects, and a House of Commons with full liberty of speech but little or no opportunity for action—for which, indeed, Bacon considered it to be fundamentally unfitted. There has been, of course, one large measure in which the House of Commons was concerned—the Franchise Bill of 1885. This Act, passed three years after Mr. Trollope's death, was expected to produce certain results, and produced very different results. •What it actually brought about was the extinction of the middle classes as a political force, and the re-establishment of the government of this country on purely aristocratic lines. Great credit is due to the hard workers among the nobility who have brought about this change. As M. Leclerc points out, they have regained, by public spirit, and by adapting themselves to circumstances, all, and more than all, of the authority wrested from them in 1832. They now rule by merit where formerly they reigned by privilege. The change is to their advantage. 'My father has often told me,' says Mr. Milbanke in *Coningsby*, 'that in his early days the displeasure of a peer of England was like a sentence of death to a man.' These evil incidents of privilege exist no longer. But in revenge the aristocracy have torn all power from the middle classes. Thus, whereas in Mr. Trollope's novels we find an idle and uninfluential nobility existing more or less on sufferance in a land controlled by a vigorous and prolific middle class, we see to-day a picture presenting precisely these features reversed: we see an all-powerful nobility controlling a country under universal suffrage, a depressed and indifferent middle class, and a flourishing democracy acquiescent in any rule that leaves them untaxed and provides them with abundance of work.

In these circumstances why should any man, not born in the purple, endeavour to enter the House of Commons unless he be a successful lawyer who desires to be made a judge, or a large employer of labour who would like to be made a baronet? He must be a dull man indeed if he can find no more amusing place of resort, and singularly incompetent if he can discover no graver

duties. The brains of the middle classes go to Egypt, to South Africa—anywhere except to St. Stephen's.

No doubt Mr. Trollope would have portrayed this interesting world had he lived to see it. But it did not exist in his days; nor were there any signs of a revolution of such magnitude in the near or even the distant future.

The authority of the Press is a conspicuous feature in Mr. Trollope's picture of English life. Hugh Stanbury makes a spirited defence of his calling to Sir Marmaduke Rowley, who does not believe in the Press:

'If the Lord Chancellor were to go to bed for a month, would he be much missed?'

'I don't know, sir. I'm not in the secrets of the Cabinet. I should think he would.'

'About as much as my grandmother; but if the Editor of the *Jupiter* were to be taken ill, it would work quite a commotion. For myself I should be glad, on public grounds, because I don't like his mode of business. But it would have an effect, because he is a leading man.'

'I don't see what all this leads to, Mr. Stanbury.'

'Only to this: that we who write for the Press think that our calling is recognised, and must be recognised, as a profession. Talk of permanence, Sir Marmaduke!—are not the newspapers permanent? Do they not come out regularly every day, and more of them, and still more of them, are always coming out? You do not expect a collapse among them.'

'There will be plenty of newspapers, I do not doubt—more than plenty, perhaps.'

'Somebody must write them, and the writers must be paid.'

'Anybody could write the most of them, I should say.'

'I wish you could try, Sir Marmaduke. Just try your hand at a leading article to-night, and read it yourself to-morrow morning.'

'I've a great deal too much to do, Mr. Stanbury.'

'Just so. You have, no doubt, the affairs of your Government to look to. We are all so apt to ignore the work of our neighbours. It seems to me that I could go over and govern the Mandarins without the slightest trouble in the world. But no doubt I am mistaken—just as you are about writing for the newspapers.'

All this is very courageous, and breathes the very best temper of the English Press—its energy, honesty, enterprise, and independence. But there are other sides to the question, which Mr. Trollope has not missed. There is the disreputable Press-man in *Phineas Finn*; and there are comments on the *Jupiter* in the case of Mr. Slope, the would-be Dean of Barchester, which show that Mr. Trollope, here as everywhere else, saw things in their just proportion. But how different is the status of the Press to-day! Sir Marmaduke would have a far better case against a twentieth-century Stanbury seeking the hand of his daughter. There are plenty of newspapers—'more than plenty,' as Sir Marmaduke prophesied; but the number of publications with which the Hugh Stanburys care to be associated has not materially increased. A view of the Press which only comprises on the one hand the Hugh Stanburys, and on the other the black-

mailer (actual or potential in both cases), leaves unconsidered the greater part of the English Press of the twentieth century. Appeals to the vanity and inquisitiveness of a large public with small sums to spend on so-called literature have proved to be very remunerative. Such journalistic enterprises have multiplied with great rapidity. The few periodicals which still maintain the nobler traditions of the English Press are now but a small, if important, fraction of the whole. Although the better part of the English Press is still the best in the world, and the worst part is very far from being as bad as much of the Continental Press, nevertheless the phrase 'to be connected with the Press' is not necessarily a recommendation in the twentieth century: it remains to be inquired 'What sort of Press?' Its actual influence is also less than it was half a century ago: probably the only considerable event directly traceable to the Press in our own time was the stoppage of the Channel Tunnel scheme.

The ground becomes more and more controversial as we proceed. We now come to the English Church as presented to us by Mr. Trollope and the English Church as it exists to-day. That conspicuous feature of English life is variously regarded. To some it is an institution of Divine origin. To others it is a harmless body, composed of men who may do useful work and save the taxpayer's money: good men provided that they do not take themselves too seriously. To others it is a decaying organisation chiefly occupied in propagating the belief in obsolete fables: it is an encumbrance which England has inherited from the past, not so picturesque as *Rouge Dragon* and *Portcullis*, but far more objectionable, because it is more in evidence and has more authority than those amiable officials.

But whatever it may be to-day there is no doubt that it has had great influence in England for thirteen hundred years: the position of the Church in any given century has to be considered before any just appreciation of the century can be attained. What was the position of the Church of the nineteenth century? According to Mr. Trollope it was nothing less than the soul of the nation. Mr. Trollope has been called here a photographer, but not from any desire to depreciate either Mr. Trollope or the pursuit of photography. The word describes Mr. Trollope's mind. It was incapable of distortion or exaggeration: it lacked the necessary originality. It reflected exactly, and his pen recorded exactly what his mind reflected. Consequently if Mr. Trollope tells us that the Church was the soul of the people, we may be very sure that it was. On what does the credibility of the phrase rest? It rests on the numerous portraits of clergymen which are to be found in his novels, and on the general tone of his characters when religious matters are under discussion. Francis Arabin, Mr. Septimus Harding, Mr. Crawley, Archdeacon Grantly and the Vicar of Bullhampton (who

has a novel all to himself)—these are some of many. Of course there were others : creatures like Obadiah Slope and Groschut, fossils like Mr. Prebendary Stanhope. Mr. Trollope knew them all. But the prevailing type, we are given to understand, was of the better sort. And what a type it was ! For learning, devout life, knowledge of men, charm of manners and commanding character it was probably unrivalled in history. The general impression of the Church of the nineteenth century is that of an army with undistinguished chiefs, but containing an admirable rank-and-file superbly officered. The Church of the twentieth century presents, on the contrary, the spectacle of brilliant generals of division supported by shaky brigadiers, and commanding a rank-and-file of which nothing can be said with certainty. The best brains of the nineteenth century went to the Church : the Church of the twentieth century deliberately discourages intellect. This is not the place for inquiring why : it is merely the place for noting the fact. In Mr. Trollope's novels we get an impression totally different from that which is produced to-day by the facts around us. This is not because Mr. Trollope saw or recorded falsely : it is because the times have changed.

Not so materially, but still to a considerable extent, have ideas changed on the subject of marriage. In Mr. Trollope's novels it appears as the most important event in life. Mr. Trollope always treats marriage seriously ; not from any desire to moralise, but merely because it was so treated in the world he lived in, and because he had to set down what he saw. One result of this is a remarkably pleasant flavour in all his books ; but another result is to accentuate our sense, in reading them, that times have changed. For Mr. Trollope, the man who does not marry is a selfish debauchee ; the girl who does not marry is a spiteful vixen. That cannot be said to-day with any approach to truth. That there will always be spiteful vixens and selfish debauchees is as certain as that the world will never be rid of other nuisances, like thistles and brambles. But every unmarried man is not a selfish debauchee, and every unmarried woman is not a spiteful vixen. Many good men remain unmarried ; the general reason assigned by the trivial, being that they prefer the luxury of their clubs to the refinement and comfort of a home. Anybody who understands dining will ridicule such a statement. No club dinner is comparable with what can be enjoyed in a well-ordered home. The reasons are obvious. If it were merely a question of dining, all men of fine taste would marry. It is something far more important than that. The altered ideas on the subject of marriage that have produced the large, if somewhat uninteresting, celibate population of these islands are traceable to the domestic legislation which was put in hand the year after Mr. Trollope's death.

That legislation was devised with admirable intentions, and has no doubt fulfilled its objects. But the laws, the general body of

opinion which has grown up in line with those laws, and the teaching of some social prophets have produced the effect that marriage, like the House of Commons, has somewhat lost its prestige. It is an 'honourable estate,' we are told at the altar. No doubt; but, like everything else in our time, it is being examined somewhat critically, and by many it is considered (as Cheviot Hill says in Mr. Gilbert's comedy) 'an unreasonably long time to be answerable for another person's expenses.' In Mr. Trollope's novels marriage appears as a duty. It is treated to-day as an episode, agreeable or the reverse, profitable or the reverse; but it is only one episode in life among many, and no sense of duty performed or neglected attaches to it.

By a different process of reasoning, perhaps, large numbers of women decide to remain celibate, not (as in Mr. Trollope's time) from inherent viciousness, but because the unmarried state appears more interesting.

It is not likely that Mr. Trollope's novels will have any vogue in the immediate future. Every page brings its own flavour of unreality, traceable perhaps to the considerations here set forth. But the very cogency of these considerations makes the novels invaluable to a student of history. The whole of the century is there, with the exception of the last twenty years.

The reader of to-day who accepts these limitations will not find that Mr. Trollope wrote too many books, or that his books were too long. But he must make up his mind to some omissions as well as some limitations. He will not find any religious or quasi-religious disquisitions posing as prophecy. He will not be asked to believe that people who talk vulgarly or ungrammatically are, for that reason, more deserving of attention than people who speak English correctly. There is an entire absence of violent language. What are known as 'strong situations' are rare. There are none of those quaint odours (some, but not all, odours of the hothouse) which waft through the pages of modern novels. Mr. Trollope did not like 'problems.' The Bible and the Church Service, on important occasions, and the conduct of a gentleman in smaller matters, were infallible rules for him. There was, therefore, not much room for 'problems' in the world as he saw it. He did indeed treat of one 'social question' in *The Vicar of Bullhampton*, and his action in doing so was considered at the time to be rather startling. But we who have read *Flames* will probably not find the earlier novel very alarming.

A novelist's view of himself cannot but be interesting. Mr. Trollope has left it on record that, if he is to 'live,' it will be through the character of Planty Pal. Some nicknames are engaging: 'Planty Pal' is not. It is an abbreviation of Plantagenet Palliser, the great-nephew and successor in title to the Duke of Omnium. When Mr. Trollope rested his hopes of fame on the character of Plantagenet

Palliser he forgot, perhaps, how he had himself written of his hero in *The Small House at Allington*: 'He was a thin-minded, plodding, respectable man, willing to devote all his youth to work, in order that in old age he might be allowed to sit among the Counsellors of the State.'

How is it possible to make anything out of a man like that? 'The last infirmity of noble minds' never produced so doddering a gait as in the case of Planty Pal. A man who owns many horses, but does not ride or race, and boasts that he knows nothing about them except that all have heads and some of them, he believes, tails; a man who has good coverts and never shoots; a man who dines alone in the library off a chop and a glass of sherry and apollinaris, or who dines in company off the first thing offered him and refuses all the rest—such a man is really not worth writing about. We are given to understand that he was clever as well as industrious, and he certainly refused the Chancellorship of the Exchequer (under circumstances highly honourable to himself) while still quite a young man. But it appears that his attention was chiefly occupied with the substitution of an imaginary coin, called a 'quint,' for the farthing, and generally with the reorganisation of the currency on the decimal system. We are also given to understand that he was a high-spirited man who would not brook interference. But the evidence laid before us does not carry much weight. Let us consider two illustrations of his independence of character; one from his private, the other from his public, life. The first is perhaps the more remarkable of the two. His uncle the Duke of Omnium was a lifelong friend of the Marquis of Hartletop, whose son Lord Dumbello married Griselda Grantly. When Lady Dumbello had been married two years people had 'begun to talk' about her and Plantagenet Palliser. The gossip had no foundation, but the Duke told his nephew that he would take it as a favour if he would stay away from Hartlebury for a time. Mr. Palliser immediately showed his independence of character. He took the earliest opportunity of making it clear to Lady Dumbello that his intentions were strictly dishonourable. It is not surprising that she put an end to his languid attentions by ordering him to find her carriage. Plantagenet could have chosen no worse occasion for the display of the respectable quality of independence of character.

The illustration of Palliser's fine character drawn from his public career is his declaration as Duke of Omnium that 'he never asked for anything in his life.' This is a grand thing for any man to be able to say, if he can say it truly. But why should we be called upon to respect a man like Plantagenet Palliser for not asking for good things? Seeing that Fortune had showered upon him with both hands all that life has to offer; seeing that he was always wealthy, and came to inherit castles and moors and palaces, with

wealth beyond computation, and that his wife brought him another enormous fortune; seeing that he was, without any trouble to himself, one of the greatest subjects in the world, and that he had nothing to desire in life except the Garter—which he refused—what can we say of a man who, placed like this, boasts that he never asked for anything?

In offering this unfavourable view of Plantagenet Palliser it is not implied that Mr. Trollope saw him inaccurately. On the contrary, every incident of his career is consistent. We may recognise the excellent work without admiring the subject. It is noteworthy that Mr. Trollope should have written as he did of so tedious a person, for at the close of the *Dumbello* imbroglio he has thrown off two incidents which by this contrast describe a really fine and sturdy character. Mrs. Grantly had sent a tender note of remonstrance to her daughter regarding the rumours which had reached the Rectory. To this Lady *Dumbello* had replied:

Dear Mamma,—I thought it best to show your letter at once to Lord *Dumbello*. He said that people would be ill-natured, and seemed to think that the telling of such stories could not be helped. As regards you, he was not a bit angry, but said that you and papa had better come to us for a week about the end of next month. Do come. We are to have rather a large dinner-party on the 23rd. His Royal Highness is coming, and I think papa would like to meet him. Have you observed that those very high bonnets have all gone out? I never liked them; and as I had got a hint from Paris, I have been doing my best to put them down. I do hope nothing will prevent your coming.

Your affectionate daughter,
G. DUMBELLO.

Carlton Gardens, Wednesday.

On this the Archdeacon said to his wife, 'If you want to go to town at all, I will take rooms for you. And for his Royal Highness! I have a great respect for his Royal Highness, but I do not in the least desire to meet him at *Dumbello's* table.'

There was no kinder or more generous father in England than Archdeacon Grantly; but he would not be a guest—not even 'to have the honour of meeting'—in a house where he knew the hostess to be a heartless little snob, even though she was his own daughter.

Plantagenet Duke of Omnium is a great piece of work; but he is not what Mr. Trollope thought that he was. Mr. Trollope read in much between the lines; but his pen could only write what was there. He intended to write down the high-minded noble, but his relentless pen has written down the Prig Unspeakable instead. We are favoured with some fragments of his conversation; he was not a talkative man, but during a life of thirty years (from five-and-twenty to five-and-fifty) it was necessary for him to open his lips occasionally. Whenever he does so he gives us the same impression of arid conceit. Take this incident from his early life.

He pays a visit to a country house—Courcy Castle—and spends the time in his rooms over Blue-books. When he descends to the drawing-room he continues reading. •

Plantagenet Palliser skimmed through his little book, and probably learned something. When he put it down he sipped a cup of tea, and remarked to Lady de Courcy that he believed it was only twelve miles to Silverbridge [this is where he was engaged to speak at a political meeting].

‘I wish it was a hundred and twelve,’ said the countess.

‘In that case I should be forced to start to-night,’ said Mr. Palliser.

‘Then I wish it was a thousand and twelve,’ said Lady de Courcy.

‘In that case I should not have come at all,’ said Mr. Palliser. He did not mean to be uncivil, and had only stated a fact.

Any comment would take away from the force of that admirable touch, ‘he did not mean to be uncivil, and had only stated a fact.’ No wonder that his wife found him intolerable; no wonder that when he came, by sheer lapse of time spent in office, to be Prime Minister in a coalition Cabinet, the promising coalition went to pieces as fast as possible.

Among the ladies two portraits stand out—Mrs. Proudie and Lily Dale. Lily Dale remained the ideal of a whole generation. Her sad story is soon told. She became engaged as a young girl to a man of whom much might be said. Adolphus Crosbie was his name. He jilted her; and she remained unmarried in consequence.

Her family were hardly surprised, ‘The Dales were ever true,’ was their motto. ‘I cannot change myself because he is changed,’ was all she had to say in answer to the eager courtship that followed her abandonment by the man she loved. The character is so gentle and tender that even forty years after it was drawn one cannot refuse a tribute of admiration; it is not the rose, but it is undoubtedly the lily. A more radiant flower was Lady George Germaine, the heroine of an almost forgotten novel, and one of Trollope’s most attractive characters. But for the moment to return to the earlier types. Mrs. Proudie is remembered by many who have forgotten Miss Dale.

Mrs. Proudie was a good woman in the worst sense of the word. Those who pass this great creature by miss a wonderful study. When she died suddenly of heart-disease her bereaved husband prayed ‘that God might save him from being glad that his wife was dead.’

These three characters—Plantagenet Duke of Omnium, Mrs. Proudie, and Lily Dale—are the only three who have in any sense become classic. But there remains a long gallery of studies. Some of these are so vivid that one is almost tempted to withdraw the description of Mr. Trollope as a photographer. All the plots are good: it is never exactly obvious how they are going to end. If one were pressed for the name of another novelist whose work comes

near to Mr. Trollope's, one would perhaps choose M. Victor Cherbuliez.

There is nothing in any of these novels so melodramatic as the trial scene in *Paul Clifford*. But there is much excellent work in connection with lawyers and law courts, and, to make a selection where all are of so high an average merit, perhaps *Is he Popenjoy?* is the most readable of all Mr. Trollope's works. It is shorter than many, its characters are all new, and it was published when Mr. Trollope's narrative style was at its best. But it would be as easy to abstract an encyclopædia as to abstract a novel of Mr. Trollope's. Never was there so great a master of detail. If he introduces you to a family, it is not enough that you should know the Head of the House: you must know a good deal of the family history, and be on bowing terms at least with some of the collateral branches. He is careful to inform you of the acreage of the family estate, whether it is profitable or not, how far it is mortgaged, and whether a town house is kept up as well as the country seat. The extraordinary thing is that you can remember this mass of detail. Ten, twenty years after reading the novels the embarrassed state of the Gresham finances is quite easy to recall. The Tregears lived in the country, and therefore did well on four thousand a year; the Longestaffes had three times that income, but were always embarrassed because they would keep up all their places and a house in town as well. One even remembers that Mr. Longestaffe put his coachman into a wig; with some idea that this important step might help him to a peerage. It is the same with the law work. If a case is introduced—or, rather, arises—in the course of his story, you must know the leading counsel on both sides, and he takes care that you cannot confuse them. You must be made acquainted with the points for both sides of the case, and taken in detail through the more important cross-examinations.

Nobody who has once read it can forget the cross-examination of Lord Fawn in *The Queen v. Finn*; that amazing piece of work which tore into shreds the case for the Crown. Nobody can forget that Baron Maltby tried Lady Mason, or can confuse Mr. Justice Staveley with his brother of the Exchequer.

It is the same in city, in country life, in politics, and in cathedral towns. It is impossible to confuse Tringle the millionaire with Melmotte the millionaire. Mr. Cohenlupe sat for Staines; although Mr. Cohenlupe was quite a subordinate figure in *The Way we Live Now*, it is out of the question to forget the name of his constituency. One knows it as assuredly as if he talked 'House of Commons' all through a long dinner-party. Even the very young men who belong to the 'Bear-garden' are distinguishable one from another—which is not always possible in real life.

His hold is not so complete over the political world. There is a

difficulty in remembering who held the subordinate parts in some of the Governments. But this is the only part of Mr. Trollope's work where the plates are a little blurred. Elsewhere, his detail is as clearly cut as possible. We remember exactly how many children Archdeacon Grantly had, and how many thousands a year income. The Vicar of Bullhampton and the Dean of Brotherton were both combative men, but are no more to be confused than one intimate friend is to be confused with another intimate friend. Mr. Emilius, Mr. Groschut and Mr. Slope are all advertising clergymen; but who could mistake Slope for Emilius? John Crumb is as different as possible from Sam Brattle; Squire Amedroz a different creature altogether from Squire Dale or Squire Carbury. Lord de Courcy, Lord Brotherton and the Marquis of Auld Reekie are all invalidish gentlemen with bad tempers; and each is as different from his brother-noble as Lord Trowbridge is from all three.

To remember all this is not a question of memory: it is the result of Mr. Trollope's method. Other writers have gone deep into detail—Lord Lytton for example, and Mr. Dickens. But nobody remembers the detail of Lord Lytton's work; and the detail of Dickens's work is remembered only after long study—the result of downright affection for the man, although it is thirty years since he left us. With Mr. Trollope it is different. His detail is remembered—cannot, in fact, be forgotten—even although it is often in appearance trivial. Every piece of detail is important and consistent with its neighbour. Even the fact that the Marquis of Mountfidgett 'bought a great many marble statues' (which was the Duke of Omnium's contemptuous way of describing a man with a cultivated taste in the fine arts) does not escape one's memory; and the Marquis of Mountfidgett is a character merely alluded to in *The Prime Minister* as a man who asked for the late Marquis's Garter and did not get it.

To say all this, if it be true, is to claim a very high place for Mr. Trollope as a master of plot and narrative; and a very high place is undoubtedly his by right. If we insist on denying that Mr. Trollope was an artist, we must at least admit that his photography was consummate; but if we are tempted to relent, and describe him as an artist, we are at once restrained by remembering the indignation with which Mr. Trollope himself repudiated the idea that he was any more of an artist than a bootmaker.

WALTER FREWEN LORD.

THE NATIVE INDIAN PRESS

WE hear a good deal of the much misunderstood Indian climate, something even in these stirring times of the much misrepresented Indian Government, but nothing of the completely ignored Indian Press, by which I mean not the *Pioneer*, the *Englishman*, the *Madras Mail*, the *Times of India*, and the like great Anglo-Indian organs of Allahabad, Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, but the papers published by Indians for Indians, whether written in English, as often happens, or in any one of a dozen or more of the many languages of the Indian Peninsula. Yet by means of these journals alone is information as to Indian, English, and world politics disseminated among the masses of India. Indeed almost exclusively to them do the educated Indians owe their news; for natural, and for the most part financial, considerations incline them to prefer their own, to the alien and expensive, Anglo-Indian, newspapers. It may be stated at once that the Indian Press, though critical, is not, with rare exceptions, disloyal, that great ability is evidenced by the articles published, and often an independent judgment, which does great credit to editors, who know too well exactly what line will be taken by almost all of their subscribers. I do not think, however, that my opinions on the Indian Press will be as welcome as extracts and abstracts whereby that Press can speak for itself. The subjects of which it treats are of course multitudinous, the method of treatment varied, and not seldom the reader sees the real India side by side with the latest notions from the West, in an equally interesting and informing juxtaposition.

Not long since in a Bombay paper, alongside admirable leading articles on politics, finance, and social reform all relating to very real movements, was an account of a crime attempted close to the magnificent capital of Western India. A boiler—a boiler on which a factory was dependent for its motive power—was out of order. The operatives in charge, seeing a wayfarer pass, offered him breakfast, and then put him inside the oven, to propitiate the evil spirit by whose influence things had gone wrong. The traveller objected so vigorously that, though he was badly burnt, science remains to this day in ignorance as to the efficacy of a completed sacrifice of

this character in the case of internal derangements of boilers—a subject with which, of late, we have all grown strangely familiar. Again, regard for a moment the native princes, what wonderful men they are! There is one, and he is one of many, of whom a very experienced statesman said: ‘Of all things in the world, he most reminds me of a clever permanent Under Secretary of State.’ It was the aptest possible description; but the prince’s aspects are kaleidoscopic. *Vis-à-vis* of the Englishman he takes this colour; but see him in his pride of place as the sacrosanct ruler of his people. Clothed in a simple loin-cloth at one moment, for the performance of religious ceremonies, blazing in jewels and cloth of gold at another, for some semi-secular function, he is, alike by his personal qualities, no less than by his birth and rank, the right man in the right place, *totus teres atque rotundus*. Of all the versatile inhabitants of this planet surely the ruling princes of our Eastern Empire are the most versatile, and the quality is widely distributed in India. The more salt in the silver cellar. That is all the difference. There is plenty of it in the Press.

To describe its attitude in respect of the war in South Africa would take a whole article, but it may be said without fear of contradiction that not a single newspaper in the whole country despaired, in the dark days when we were repeatedly encountering that species of check which, when we meet it ourselves, we call a ‘reverse.’ On the contrary, never before in its history did the Indian Press brush aside all smaller issues, forget all its disagreements with the Government and its servants, and offer up one loud, continuous, and evidently sincere prayer for the speedy arrival of that victory, which they never doubted would be ours. Never have denunciations of Russia been more frequent, and never have we heard less of ‘the treasure vainly poured out upon the frontier’ than at this epoch. The only complaint made was that Indian troops were not allowed to share the present dangers and eventual triumphs of the campaign. It can therefore be easily imagined with what satisfaction the news was received that an Indian contingent and an Imperial Service Corps were to be despatched to China, and ruler after ruler vied, each with the other, in renewing those offers which circumstances made it impossible for the Government to accept on a former occasion. It must, however, be confessed that while the Indian journals were loyal to the backbone in hoping for a speedy and successful termination to the war, they adopted, as regards the circumstances leading to and preceding the outbreak of hostilities, what has become known as a ‘pro-Boer attitude,’ however inappropriate such a description may be in the case of those who are heart and soul for British victory. However, the great point is that the editors one and all fought as good a fight on our side with their pens, as the men whose trade is fighting would have fought with their swords, had they been given the chance of

flinging away the scabbard, and rushing with the English to the front.

The famine is of course one of the chief subjects on which editors and contributors write, and they have written so much as to make the task of abstracting their views somewhat difficult. Yet the main lines are easy to indicate. All allow that the Government has made efforts on the whole as successful as they are gigantic and unprecedented, but many, most perhaps, protest that the causes of famine are not to be sought solely in the capricious and unfavourable character of the seasons. They adopt to a considerable extent the views expressed by Mr. R. C. Dutt, late President of the National Indian Congress, to the effect that over-assessment, or in other words rack-renting, by Government of its ryots, or tenants for the most part with permanent occupancy rights, is to a great extent at any rate the cause of these disasters. Now this too is a position which may be shaken, but can hardly be carried by a passing assault. Yet since the gravamen of the charge lies in its being levelled at our administration, it is an awkward fact that only in native States which we do not administer, has there been any actual failure to feed the hungry. It is the fact that of British provinces and districts this famine has been sorest in those which are most lightly assessed, the Central Provinces, and in Bombay, which has been held up as an example to others. Again, critics of this class talk as if famines had been invented by the British, whereas they were immeasurably more disastrous and probably as frequent before we had covered the peninsula with a network of communications. At any rate in Bombay between 1647 and 1878 there were fourteen famines sufficiently severe to have earned descriptions by native historians, who thought them hardly worthy of record unless half the population of the affected districts was wiped off the face of the earth. There was no effort to fight famine in those days. It was a visitation, and the stricken succumbed.

However, the Indian papers freely admit that the Government gave its money, and the labours and lives of its officers without stint, and was very sensible of the charity of the British public evidenced by the Mansion House Fund. At the risk of weary reiteration, and with little hope of succeeding where Lord George Hamilton and Lords Curzon and Onslow have apparently failed, it may again be stated that this fund is not intended to feed those whom the Government of India sends empty away, for there are none such, but to provide comforts for the weak and caste-ridden, which could not properly be debited to the public exchequer, and to help the distressed agriculturists to face the world again after the famine. They know this in India, and the *Hindu* of Madras says, 'The British sympathy now extended to our suffering people deserves our enduring gratitude.' At Ahmedabad, lately visited by Lord Curzon, one of the worst famine

centres, considerable ill-feeling arose owing to the operations of hide merchants. Only poor miserable cattle, which would have died of starvation, were slaughtered for their skins by a firm of English and Mahomedan dealers; but 'the religious feelings of Hindus were roused,' says the *Indian Mirror* of Calcutta, 'by the slaughter of these dumb creatures of God, which were bought up in thousands by pious Hindus in order to save their lives.' The Hindus also organised a strike of all their traders. 'This hide business is at best a revolting one. The problem must be faced. It is not only a question of disturbing the religious susceptibilities of Hindus and Jains. It is more largely an agrarian question.' In another issue, the same journal, one of the best and most widely read in Bengal, has a leading article on the remedies for plague and famine :

Science, sanitary and medical, has had a free hand in Bombay; a million of money has been spent, and the plague is more virulent than ever. The Westerners, ever reliant on their science, have been compelled to come to the conclusion that God alone can send rain to fertilise the fields, and God alone can take away the plague. When we find material efforts to alleviate suffering unavailing, we must turn from the physical to the moral and spiritual plane. Our ancient Rishis foresaw these evils and their cause, the wickedness of man, and they prescribed the remedies.

A quotation follows from an abstract of what the holy books say in this behalf :

When the land is contaminated, men should, at the time of milking cows, let the milk fall directly on the ground and moisten it. They should also fast. Deeds of charity and sacrifices in behalf of ancestors should be performed in every house, village, and city. For 'Impiety is the root of all diseases.'

So says Charaka, the highest authority in medical science.

The planets should be propitiated. The observance of these good rules will create in men a kind of psychic force which will purify the tainted soil, water, &c., and render them wholesome.

Vishnu should be worshipped in every house with offerings of leaves of *tulasi*.

Such holy observances will put an end to all pestilential diseases like the bubonic plague, malarious fever, cholera, &c. There will be timely showers of rain, followed by abundant harvests; men will pass their lives in the enjoyment of health and peace. Nothing else can contribute to the happiness of mankind.

The *tulasi* is *Ocimum sanctum* or holy basil, and the little plant grows on the altar in the house of every follower of Vishnu. The Shastras give milk where the Sufis give wine, but the prescription is very like Omar Khayyam's :

And not a drop that from our cups we throw
For earth to drink of, but will steal below
To quench the fire of anguish in some eye,
There hidden far beneath and long ago.

To the plague, of course, innumerable articles are devoted. One of the latest from the *Indu-Prakash* really gives the substance of

them all, while its immediate reference is to the plague riots in Cawnpore :

We wonder how long, and in how many places, is the old story to be repeated, as if to prove how incorrigible and incapable of learning lessons from the bitterest experiences are some of our official magnates. Cawnpore is the latest addition to the distressfully long list—distressful because it is such a reflection on our official world! And we suppose that more bitter experiences still may have to be learnt if the officials blunder over again in the good old way in the more sturdy, more excitable, and more unreasoning populations of Northern India, which the plague is now threatening. Fortunately, Sir Antony MacDonnell is at the helm of affairs in the North-West Provinces, and so the Cawnpore riots have ended, not in stories of discontent and conspiracies and prosecutions and deportations for sedition, but in the thorough establishment of the isolation-at-home and trust-in-people system of plague administration. Are we in Bombay never to have that system?

The policy thus described and desired is that which has been followed all along by Sir John Woodburn in Bengal, with the result that the people are assisting the authorities in the execution of such mild measures as are at once practicable, acceptable, and, so far as we know, far more efficacious than compulsory segregation and other restrictions and interferences, which are as dangerous as they have been proved to be futile and exasperating. The visits of Lord Curzon to affected localities in Calcutta are frequently acknowledged in local journals in a spirit of gratitude and approval.

The question of an Imperial famine grant, of course, is much discussed. The Indian Press seems to agree with the non-official additional members of the Viceroy's Council, to whose attitude I had occasion to refer in a letter to the *Times* of the 1st of August. The *Hindu* of Madras writes :

India is the only land in the world where begging is made an honourable profession by its ancient lawgivers; and our modern rulers and lawgivers, belonging as they do to a different civilisation, have, in this respect, become easy and willing converts to the Hindu religion. British, modern, and Christian India is the prince of the world's beggars. The English Government raise loans for the South African war. Surely this is the far wiser and more honourable course for fighting the curse of famine. Is not the credit of the Indian Government good for this very paltry amount needed? It is shameful to the people and to our Government that once in every three years or so they should have to send the hat around in this woful state. The Government should annually contribute towards the formation of a Famine Fund of twenty millions or so, from which to meet the expenses of famine when it occurs.

The *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* of Calcutta, which once, at any rate, had the reputation of being the most critical opponent of the British Government, says :

The time may come when the rulers may find it difficult to make the two ends meet. The time may come when the hopeless misery of the people, the dying agonies of the starved, may compel the rulers to leave the country to its fate. If such a catastrophe overtakes us, then India will be ruined, and England reduced

into a third-rate Power. For, if India falls, England is bound to fall along with it. Such a crisis ought to be averted by all means.

The case is not hopeless. By relieving India of a portion of the cost of the white garrison the burden may be much reduced. There is no doubt that the Empire is in danger, which can be removed by economy and reduction of expenditure. Any further taxation is impossible.

The *Indian Spectator* writes: 'Somehow this proposal of an Imperial grant is one which we are unable to entertain with enthusiasm.' In fact, they all say, 'We want no more than financial justice, and we can pay our way.' The Budget shows that, with a loan, they can.

Of the gratitude of the people many examples might be quoted, but one of the most touching was the voluntary gift by a Bengal Infantry Regiment of a day's pay all round to the Widows and Orphans' War Fund, with the remark that 'the English people are saving the lives of our women and children in the famine, so should we do something for the widows and orphans of Englishmen slain in the war.' Perhaps this noble gift was not unanimous? Well, it was not, for there was a division of opinion, many sepoys wishing to give two days' pay. The action of Government has throughout been warmly acknowledged. At first some doubts were expressed by the *Indian Press*, I mean, of course, as to the wisdom of a circular calling on famine officers to restrict relief to those who really needed help from the State; but it was subsequently acknowledged that this necessary caution had not led to the rejection of applicants. In practice all who came received help—those who could work, in return for labour in proportion to their strength; those who could not, as a charitable dole. The *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* acknowledged that relief works were opened full early, and wrote:

If any Governor-General of India is ever destined to fulfil that solemn and sacred pledge of the British nation, namely, that no man, woman, or child would be allowed to die of starvation, and thus to earn the choicest blessings of Heaven, it is perhaps Lord Curzon.

It must not be forgotten that Bombay marches with the stricken and impoverished native States of Rajputana, and that thence and from other territories not under British rule, famine subjects, too far gone to recover, flock on to British relief works, spreading sickness ere they themselves succumb.

It may also be noticed that a Bombay paper, the *Akhbar-i-Soudagar*, made the following remarks, corroborating those of the *Times* correspondent, of exaggerations communicated to the English Press, the name of which is Legion:

It is, indeed, very annoying and vexatious that at a time when the officers are expected to put their best energies forward, and are more or less busy day and night in alleviating the distress of the poorer population, outsiders should, without making full and fair inquiries, make statements in public prints which may reflect

on the good faith and righteous performance of duty on the part of the officials. Lord Northcote's Government has done well in promptly instituting inquiry into the matter and acquainting the public with the true state of affairs.

Famine and its inevitable accompaniment, cholera, are bad enough without exaggeration. To this day half the readers of the daily Press believe that six millions of our fellow-subjects were being starved, instead of being saved from starvation.

The agricultural conditions of the country come under notice chiefly with reference to the famine, and the land assessment, questions. But the *Hindu Patriot* of Calcutta calls for greater attention to agricultural education and for the establishment of schools with a view to improving the existing indigenous system. The *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* of Calcutta also asks for the industrial development of the country, and for the reimposition of import duties.

Personal references are less frequent than in the English and American Press, and there is no disposition whatever to pry into the private life of public characters. The Viceroy and the Secretary of State of course receive the lion's share of attention. References to their acts and words are too numerous for consideration on this occasion. Covering as they do the whole ground of Indian administration, they need separate treatment. One characteristic extract, however, should not be omitted. The *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* writes :

Lord Curzon is the first Viceroy who has testified to the loyalty of the Indians ; and that not in mere vague phrases, but by his bold action. ' Would you like to have some troops from here for service in South Africa ? ' telegraphed he to the Home authorities. They replied : ' Of course, we would be glad. But would it be safe to weaken the white garrison in India ? Send as many as you like, but mind, you must do so on your own responsibility. ' Lord Curzon took that responsibility and did send British troops from here. This was a bold step worthy of the great man who wields the destinies of the Indian Empire just now. He did what none of his predecessors had ventured to do before.

The editor apparently knows all the secrets of the Home and Indian Governments, perhaps better than he realises what the British Empire really owes to the prompt despatch of those troops from India. The late Sir William Lockhart was much beloved of the Hindus, ' whose holy men he sought out and conversed with, in all the nobility and catholicity of true religion ' (*Indian Mirror*). Indeed the *Hindu Patriot* heard people say ' that he was a Hindu in a former birth, of which his love of the Hindu religion was but a natural consequence. ' Lord Northcote in Bombay, and Lord Amphill in Madras, are both much praised in the papers.

Of the late Mr. G. W. Steevens, ' A Mild Hindu ' writes to the *Bengalee*, in a strain which belies his own description of himself, when he says that this talented author's death suggests that ' God

does not permit the reviling of a helpless nation by individual members of the dominant race.' He improves the occasion by showing that 'such Divine vengeance overtook all the members of the Benares town council who voted for the new waterworks and water rate, while all who opposed the measure still survive.' Let Progressives on the London County Council take note of this, and moderate their zeal.

Lord Curzon's eulogy on the late Finance Minister, Mr. Clinton Dawkins, found many echoes. The *Indian Mirror* dwelt on his freedom 'from bureaucratic prejudices, his accessibility to all,' and took the opportunity of endorsing the Viceroy's criticism of mechanical and bureaucratic administration. The *Rast Gofar*, a Mahomedan organ, says Lord Curzon and Mr. Dawkins 'did all men could do in a year;' but the *Gujarati*, without denying this, asks where is the 'elasticity' we are asked to see in Indian finance, while millions of taxpayers are helplessly driven to relief works in bad seasons? This criticism is repeated for the benefit of Sir E. Law.

It is not often that English sportsmen are honoured with notice; and indeed Reuter's frequent messages concerning cricket matches annoy the newspaper editors, and provoke reflections which sometimes find expression in England concerning the national game, of which the conditions are such that, while everyone professes to be wildly excited as to the result, only occasionally can either side possibly win. The purchaser of Flying Fox, however, got his paragraph:

The English [writes the *Indian Mirror*] are passionately fond of horses and dogs. In fact, those animals are valued by them as high as their women, and at times more. But whoever heard of as much as 37,000 guineas paid for the purchase of a single horse?

Elsewhere a leader in the same journal enlarges on the subject of sport:

We welcome the introduction of innocent pastimes like cricket, football, and tiger-shooting, but we do object to fox-hunting and pigeon-shooting. Where is the fair play and manliness of such sports? They hurt the feelings of the Hindus; and cannot such sportsmen buy their mince pies in the bazaar?

Here probably for the first time we have tiger-shooting bracketed with cricket and football, fox-hunting coupled with pigeon-shooting, and pigeons and foxes served up in the same pie.

The *Mirror*, however, takes a great interest in, without wishing to unduly encourage, sport. When a portrait of that great sportsman, the late Maharaja of Patiala, appeared in *Vanity Fair*, with a letterpress accompaniment giving a brief account of his prowess on the field of real and of mimic battle, the *Mirror* admitted, apparently with some reluctance, that His Highness's record 'would do honour

to an English country gentleman.' The same journal makes the following remarks on the training of young Rajas :

The idea of placing a young Hindu prince, who is going to rule over a Hindu people, under the care of a European tutor, without allowing his own family or people a voice in his bringing-up, is a most unnatural one. Lord Roberts was wise enough to ridicule such an arrangement. But the procedure is ever recurring, with the result that ruling Indian chiefs become strangers among their own people, and even in their own household.

It should be remarked that this extract has no reference whatever to that immediately preceding it, which concerns an individual Hindu prince.

On the frontier question most Indian papers complain of the cost of the little wars, of the policy, or want of policy, which led up to them, and all approve the step lately taken, whereby troops are withdrawn from certain advanced posts on the frontier, and replaced by local militia and police corps, alike in the interests of economy and efficiency. The *Bengalee*, a very important Calcutta paper, while condemning the Afghan buffer policy root and branch, quotes Skobelev's statement that 'England is a vampire sucking the last drop of India's blood,' and adds, 'India thinks otherwise. Russian rule would blast our hopes of political progress and advancement and destroy our dreams of self-government.'

Few subjects receive more frequent notice than the so-called 'English and Native question.' The *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* says :

England's unpopularity on the Continent is the mere tribute of jealousy to success. But it is a serious matter, if Englishmen are unpopular in India. Yet they are brusque and bigoted, and an Englishman who mixes freely with the natives is persecuted by his countrymen. Mahomedan rulers and Hindu ruled differed over matters of sentiment, but got on together, though the former killed cows to annoy the latter, and not merely for beef as the English do. Nor do our present rulers ever desecrate temples or carry off women. But the fact is India was alike the home of ruler and ruled. There were no tributes. None the less, if the English proposed to leave, the people would entreat them to remain. The Indians have forgotten how to fight, because they are not allowed to fight, and, forbidden to govern, they have unlearned the art of government. Why is loyal India less kindly treated than disloyal Ireland? India never mutinied, but only the sepoys. India wants no parliament or separation, but only justice on a few minor issues.

The *Bengalee* in a strain of sarcasm comments on the inadequate punishment awarded to Europeans for using violence towards Indians, and suggests the passing of a White Man's Exemption Act, declaring Europeans to be exempt from the purview of all enactments providing punishments for such offences. The Viceroy's action in this behalf meets with warm and unqualified approval.

In fact, historians and others do not always distinguish with sufficient clearness between the mutinous sepoys and the Indian

villagers, who were by no means universally unfriendly, and very frequently saved the survivors of the Mutiny at the risk of their own lives. Nor is some exasperation unnatural when a leading Anglo-Indian journal states 'that the Hindu lies by preference, and that the deep-seated canker at the heart of Indian life is its hopeless want of honesty, its unexampled mendacity.' Such was not the opinion of Sleeman, Lawrence, Outram, Fayrer, and many others of their class, nor indeed is it my own.

On public instruction, reams upon reams are written, all in favour, of course, of lavish expenditure by Government on higher education. Lord Curzon is claimed as a warm friend of this cause, because in his Convocation speech as Chancellor of Calcutta University he said: 'Nothing was more striking than the manner in which the science and learning of the Western world had penetrated the Oriental mind, teaching independence of judgment and liberty of thought.' The *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* thinks 'the English are less anxious now than they were to acclimatise Western science, art, and literature in India, and the education now imparted is spurious and artificial, doing some good and much harm.' The *Bengalee*, taking up the commonplace criticism that Indian youths look on education only as a means to obtaining Government appointments, remarks 'that it is an impertinence in those who pursue knowledge for gain only, to make this charge against Hindus, who formerly, at any rate, pursued knowledge for its own sake. Now there is no rest and repose for so doing. The University sets a premium on haste and cram.' This is very like Matthew Arnold's stanza on our English unrest. In fact, it is a complaint that we have inoculated India with the disease:

We see all sights from pole to pole,
And glance, and nod, and bustle by,
And never once possess our soul
Before we die.

Religion will never fail to occupy its allotted, and perhaps the largest, space in the newspapers, and India is proud of the effect produced on modern thought by the writings of its sages and philosophers. The *Indian Mirror* no doubt reflects India's views in this behalf, and it sees in an earthquake which early this year visited Southern and Western India a portent of evil:

Our words, deeds, and thoughts leave their impress on the ether, and so create corresponding disturbances on the earth. These great upheavals come to warn men to repent and mend their ways. We pollute the air by our sinful words, acts, and thoughts. Man becomes an universal contaminating agency. The Hindu has no place among the nations, because he has fallen away from his religion. He should go back to his *Shastras*. The Rishis knew men must live in purity. Spiritual and religious concerns should come first, political effort should come after them.

The Bishop of Calcutta issued an encyclical letter couched in a very broad and tolerant spirit, but assuming, of course, that

Christianity is the only true religion, and also asserting that India would gain by its adoption. The *Mirror* says: 'These assumptions are quietly and not offensively made, and the new Bishop and new Viceroy both alike desire that a new era of friendliness should be inaugurated.' The same journal refers to the thanksgiving services held by Hindus, Parsees, and Mahomedans for our African victories, and sharply criticises an Anglican Bishop who said, 'We should co-operate with God.' 'What a travesty of Christianity! The Man of Sorrows said to God, "Thy will be done," but the Anglican Bishop co-operates with the Almighty!' A leader in another issue might have been written on Horace's text:

Delicta majorum immeritus lues,
Romane, donec templa refeceris,
Ædesque labentes deorum.

. The spirit of rationalism and criticism evoked by Occidental influences has undermined the foundations of Aryan faith and religion. The festivals of the gods are neglected, life is one long struggle for existence, a warding-off of want. A religious revival would stimulate our national faith and feeling.

And such a revival is stated to be now in progress. 'In religion and spirituality lay our ancient supremacy, and in them too lies our future supremacy. Our gods are gradually becoming gods of all the cultured world. We must not fret because we are not a ruling nation. Power and wealth are ephemeral; only spiritual treasures are unfading and eternal.' The Maharaja of Dharbanga is indicated as the natural leader of the movement, not only because he is one of the most prominent noblemen in India, but also because to great wealth and position he adds the inestimable advantage of being a Brahmin. One may become a king, but one must be born a Brahmin.

The *Tribune* of Lahore, at any rate, does not think that Hindu social and religious systems have much to learn from us. 'Christianity,' it writes, 'humanised the people of the West; but they have now outgrown that religion, and want something more ethereal, more potent than what was presented by Jesus to half barbarians like the Jews.' And the *Tribune* offers the personality the material West requires in the prophet Gauranga, of Nadia in Bengal. The *Hindu Patriot* in like manner deplures the way 'in which legislation affecting the social institutions of the country, such as the Civil Marriage, and the Age of Consent Act, have been forced upon an unready and unwilling people.' In October 1890 I wrote against the latter Bill in the pages of this review. It passed, but has been a dead letter, which no effort is made to enforce. The same may be said of another Act, which 'prescribed a form of marriage,' the other day, for the inhabitants of the Malabar coast, who have enjoyed a form of their own for thousands of years, and are probably

the most contented, comfortable, and uncomplaining people in India. The latter law, indeed, is permissive, but all such laws become dead matter, encumbering the statute book, or, being enforced, engender discontent and disaffection. There are others of the same sort, and the clever lawyer, who frequently 'represents' the people on the Legislative Councils, too often represents progress with a capital P, and misrepresents the masses, who are linked together by one hatred of interference with their customs, which indeed Her Majesty guaranteed the people, when the administration was assumed by the Crown.

A proof of this position will be found in the references to current legislation, which, of course, are numerous. For example, the Indian papers generally—though there are conspicuous exceptions—disapprove a Bill before the Madras Legislative Council, for taking the gains of learning out of the joint family property, and securing to the person who makes them, the fruits of his own skill, learning, and education. This seems at first sight fair enough; but the joint family funds provided the skill, learning, and education, and should be recouped for the joint benefit. Not to argue the point here, the Press urges that the Bill deals with the interests of a microscopic minority, is a new departure, and will, *pro tanto*, tend to break up the Hindu family system. The Famine Commission, in vain, as it appears, pointed out that the breaking up of ancestral properties, under the case-made law of the Privy Council, 'entails social, administrative, and agricultural evils of the gravest character.'

The majority of the Indian papers hold the same opinion as regards this proposal to break up, so far as its purview extends, the joint family system, and it is curious to see a leading Anglo-Indian journal like the *Madras Mail* supporting them, while they are opposed in this behalf by a leading Indian paper, the *Madras Hindu*.

But India is the land of paradox. The people will accept and absorb new ideas and principles, but only at their own time and in their own way. An English official may truly represent the masses, while the Indian 'representative' may express the views of the Radical advanced guard. Many articles will be written, and the water of many monsoons will flow over many sandy beds before this subject is exhausted.

‘AUSTRALIA FOR THE WHITE MAN’ AGAIN

The grinders cease, because they are few

THE perennial problem in Queensland is that which touches coloured labour. It is a pity, therefore, that a Colony which, without reservation, threw her particular politics into the common crucible should suffer so rude a shock as that proceeding from the Federal Premier's recent utterance at Maitland. It is true that Mr. Barton has in subsequent speeches tempered his blunt dictum that black labour must go, by explaining that no repressive legislation is immediately contemplated; but it is evident that the attractive euphemism, ‘Australia for the White Man,’ is still doing political duty in the Australian Colonies. In 1885 the same cry carried Sir Samuel Griffith into power; but it was to be supposed that by 1892 the ultra-patriotic party would have realised the uselessness of kicking against the pricks. Evidently the five years of *Sturm und Drang* which followed hard upon the Amending Act of 1885 have been forgotten by certain public men in a new political anxiety. It is, however, to be hoped that no colony will have to rue its trustful embarkation in the Federal ship. Without doubt Mr. Barton takes high and proper ground in declaring that henceforth the interests of All Australia must stand before the interest of any particular State, and that provincial selfishness must not unduly affect Federal politics; but the Commonwealth will not be strengthened or sustained by the sacrifice of any one province to a sentiment which too often avoids practical necessity.

It is now twelve years since I studied Queensland questions on the spot; but I am not forgetful of the conditions under which Australian sugar was, and is, successfully produced—conditions which, to my mind, must be maintained if the manufacture of sugar is to remain a profitable industry.

Before dealing at large with the employment of the Kanaka, a general statement of the system may be in place. One has only to glance at the map of Australia to see that, in the nature of things, the question of coloured labour must exist. Queensland lies latitudin-

ally between 10° and 29° south of the Equator. It therefore stands to the southern tropics in the same position as India, Burmah, Siam, Arabia, the Sahara desert, Mexico, and Central America occupy in the northern. The world over, sugar, cotton, rice, and coffee can be satisfactorily cultivated only by the employment of black labour. That is almost an axiom. White labour has its physical limitations, and the tropical sun obdurately imposes one of them. It is not asserted here that the white man has never cut cane in the fields; but where he has attempted it he has either gone down in the struggle or presently refused 'to do nigger's work.' In Mauritius, in the West Indies, in Demerara, in Java, in Natal, and in all sugar-growing countries, black labour is indispensable for the field work, and the industry exists and succeeds by reason of it.

In Queensland, however, Kanaka labour has made and unmade governments, and it will do so again. Public opinion flowed one way in 1885, and just as strongly back again in 1892. The years between were the seven lean years for sugar-cane, and scores of thousands of pounds' worth of machinery lay idle. It had been declared by the Legislature that black labour must go; the industry languished, the planter lost heart—and money; and the whole colony felt a decrease of prosperity.

But to outline the system in Queensland. A sugar plantation may be only 160 acres, or it may be ten times as large. In normal cases the planter requires one Kanaka for every six acres. This coloured labour he obtains from the Polynesian Islands, at a cost of about twenty pounds for the transport of each man. The Kanaka is engaged for a term of three years, at the end of which period, if the engagement is not renewed, the planter is bound to return him to the island whence he came. This coloured labour is specifically confined to 'tropical or semi-tropical agriculture,' a provision which guards against its competition with white labour in higher pursuits. During his engagement the Kanaka is housed, clothed, and fed; and his rations and other allowances are specified by Act of Parliament, and secured to him by the supervision of a Government 'protector.' Medical attendance is also provided; and his money wage is 6*l.* a year. His hours of work are eight hours a day in winter, and nine in summer. The rest of the day is his own, and Saturday is a half, and Sunday a whole holiday. These are the regulations which prevail at the present time; and, while they may be occasionally transgressed, in the main they are strictly carried out. The Royal Commission of 1885 discovered and condemned many abuses in connection with the transportation of Polynesians; but Rear-Admiral Lord Charles Scott, C.B., who was instructed by the Imperial Government to watch the recruiting of Kanakas in the islands of the Western Pacific, was able to report that 'no fault was to be found with the recruiting system since 1885,' and that 'he

cannot, after careful consideration, condemn it,' Mr. Kinnaird Rose, the legal member of the Royal Commission on the Polynesian Labour Trade, wrote in 1892 :•

Nor a single complaint has been made since 1885 of illegal recruiting, nor even of practices which by strict interpretation might be called irregular. . . . The calumnies about slavery and oppression, and so on, have been pretty effectually disposed of. Kanakas can now be engaged in their own island homes for a term of service in Queensland as much free from constraint and over-reaching as agricultural servants can be engaged at hiring fairs in Great Britain and Ireland ; and separation from home ties and family associations is no more morally wrong in one case than in the other.

Nor does the social or economic aspect of the question alter its legitimacy. Kanaka labour in Queensland is both expedient and inevitable. Socially, the Polynesian field-worker occupies a position far removed from slavery. He is much too costly for abuse—a fact which is quite as potent as paternal legislation to secure his comfort and well-being. In the eye of the law he is the equal of the white man, and violence done him is speedily reported to the 'protector,' through whom his assailant may be indicted for assault. While his physical maintenance is secure, his moral welfare is not neglected—the employer is quick to see that consideration brings its own reward in more cheerful labour. The crowning proof of the Kanaka's well-being is his usual anxiety to renew his three years' contract rather than return home.

. It does not appear that the employment of coloured labour on the sugar plantations takes the bread out of any man's mouth, since the white man refuses the job. In the production of sugar white and black labour are complementary energies. The white man cannot, and will not, cut the sugar-cane ; but the field labour of the Kanaka in Queensland makes work for at least thirty thousand overseers, engineers, firemen, smiths, and others engaged in the process of refining. The sugar industry creates a demand for machinery, a need for shipping, and a very considerable consumption of coal. It may be assumed that it affects, directly or indirectly, every other industry in Queensland. Queensland has found this out, however, by a series of painful and costly experiments. There were, and probably still are, men in Australia who say, 'Better the country a desert than endure this anachronism of civilisation ;' but these have no real knowledge of the circumstances, no conception of the exact place the industry holds in the trade of the country. The findings of the Royal Commission of 1885 disturbed the sensibilities of the people, and a five-year limit was forthwith placed on the issuing of licenses for importing coloured labour ; but its effect only went to show that black labour was the *sine qua non* of cane-growing. As I have stated above, a period of intense depression ensued.

To define this depression more particularly. The banks refused to

make further advances for the continuation of a doomed industry ; and the sugar business went from bad to worse. The planters realised the hopelessness of trying to carry on an industry without suitable labour. The cane was left uncut, and the mills closed down. The output fell from sixty-nine thousand tons in 1890 to fifty-one thousand tons in 1891 ; in 1892 there were only 72 mills in operation, as against 166 in 1885. Ruin was hardly stayed by the earnest provision which the Government made for securing cheap white labour. Agents sought to recruit the labour market from Great Britain, Germany, and Denmark, but without success. In fact, all such schemes were wrecked by the Queensland labour unions, on whose behalf the step had been taken. Mr. Chataway's plan of small holdings and central Government mills was given a fair trial at Mackay, but while it justified itself in some respects, it failed to solve the problem. The effect of the embargo at length became so obviously ruinous that its own sponsor could no longer endure it ; and in 1892 Sir Samuel Griffith issued his manifesto. This, as everyone knows, provided for a continuance of Kanaka labour for ten years. Careful regulations were drafted to prevent the recurrence of abuses. These are the regulations heretofore described, and they are still in effect.

In the face of that experience it seems unfortunate that Mr. Barton should make the abolition of black labour a part of his policy. Neither is his selection of Mr. Drake as Queensland's representative in the Federal Cabinet a source of comfort for the sugar-planters, for the new Postmaster-General frankly confesses his opposition to black labour. Indeed, he is one of the minority who strove against the extension of Polynesian labour in 1892, and one of the few eminent men in Queensland whom time has not converted. Even Mr. W. H. Groom, under whose chairmanship the Royal Commission reported against the continuance of the Kanaka, and who for many years on the platform and in the press has steadily sought to exclude the Polynesian, has changed his views, and, in a speech delivered by him not long since, he declared that the sugar industry was too important to be imperilled by any sudden attempt to do without coloured labour.

Like the United States, Australia has every variety of soil, and climates both tropical and temperate. She is self-contained, and if her tropical industries are to receive their natural development, tropical labour is indispensable. But this is a matter of expediency, not of principle, and men who hold these views are not without hope that changing conditions may alter them. The sugar-planter, no less than his fellow-countrymen, wishes Australia to be a white man's continent ; he is, however, unwilling to believe that a regulated supply of Polynesian labour is a menace to that proper ambition and determination. A reasonable, yet exacting, system of indenture and the tentative residence of Kanakas do not compromise that faith.

A bitter experience has convinced him that for some time to come the black man is necessary, and, indeed, that the black man is all that stands between the reclaimed cane-fields and their reversion to a state of tropical wilderness. He is not without hope that the day will come—perhaps after a generation or two of acclimatisation—when black labour may go and white labour shall take its place; but he knows that time, not legislation, is the only specific. Meanwhile, he knows that in the field the white man (even when he can be got to attempt it) costs more and is worth less than the Kanaka; and Australia must needs have the cheapest possible labour to enable her to compete with the bounty-fed sugar of foreign nations. An industry which annually produces one and a-half million sterling should not be sent to the wall by ill-considered Federal legislation which has its origin in a misconceived race question.

GILBERT PARKER.

KOREA FROM THE JAPANESE STANDPOINT

SEVENTEEN centuries ago the Japanese emperor Chuai was playing his lute in the presence of his wife and prime minister. Whether on account of the music or from some other cause, the empress became inspired with a divine afflatus and began to utter the thoughts put into her mind by the deity. 'There is a land to the westward,' she exclaimed, 'and in that land is abundance of treasure, gold and silver, dazzling to look upon. This land I will now bestow upon you.'

The emperor pushed away his lute. 'If you go up to a high place and look towards the west,' said he, 'there is no land to be seen, but only the great waters. They are lying spirits who have spoken to you.'

Then the god was filled with anger and again he moved the empress to prophesy. 'You are not fit,' she said, 'to rule this empire. Go the one road!'

But the prime minister trembled when he heard these words, and said to his master, 'I am troubled, my heavenly sovereign, by this terrible message. Continue, I pray, to play the angust lute.'

The emperor Chuai commenced to play softly: gradually the sound died away; all was still. They held a light to his face and saw that he was dead. But the empress put herself at the head of her fleet, invaded the land of gold and silver with her warriors, and soon made the three kingdoms of Korea tributary to Japan.

These things happened, we are told, in the year 201 A.D., and the story of the valiant empress is as familiar to a Japanese as is that of Boadicea to ourselves. From that time to this Korea has always held a foremost place in the imagination of the Japanese people, and now, when the fate of the peninsula seems trembling in the balance, it may throw some light on the probable action of Japan in the near future to note how much she has owed to Korea in the past and how much she depends on that country in the present. A many-sided sentiment, the tradition of conquest, and the need of food and space to live in, all play an important part in that complex feeling which

may at any moment prompt a race not easily duped with assurances again to take up arms so recently laid aside.

The first and perhaps the most important debt owed by Japan to Korea was on account of the introduction of the Buddhist religion. This faith found its way northwards and eastwards until in the middle of the first century it prevailed so widely in China that a special deputation was sent to India by the emperor Ming Ti, with commands to procure copies of the sacred books. This was successfully accomplished; Buddhism flourished exceedingly in its new home; it spread from China to Korea, and from Korea was carried by missionaries to the islands of Japan, where at that time the people were far behind their neighbours on the mainland in civilisation. Whatever may be thought of Buddhism as an elevating influence, few would deny that it was above and beyond the barren faith of Shintoism from an educational point of view. And with the new religion came new ideas of science, a new literature, a broader philosophy, and a gradual solvent of insular bigotry. From the end of the sixth century, when the first Buddhist temple was erected in Japan, to this day, Buddhist ideas and refinements have permeated the minds of the people. It may be, as many thoughtful Japanese believe, that Buddhism has lived its allotted time, and that Shintoism, the indigenous and official religion of the country, is more suited to the present needs of Japan. It may be that the desperate efforts now being made by the Japanese Buddhists to revive the ancient glories of their faith are doomed to failure. Still the teaching has entered into the very fibre of the race, and the Shintoist or agnostic can no more divest himself of the modes of thought adopted from Korea by his ancestors than he can rid himself of the blood which runs in his veins. In the case of the common people the two creeds are so inextricably mixed that the man who figures in a procession in honour of Hachiman to-day will pay a bonze to bang his gong to-morrow.

In this way then Japan is deeply indebted to a country which, like Ireland in our own case, was a fountain of light when the sun had as yet scarcely risen on the eastern islands. Nor is this the only respect in which the stories of Ireland and Korea resemble one another.

The next great debt which Japan owes to Korea is her Art. This may sound strange to Europeans, who are accustomed to associate the so-called 'Land of Morning Calm' with constant and bloody riots, gross ignorance, and uncouth hats; and to globe-trotters who find nothing more artistic to bring home with them than certain quaint brazen vessels provocative of mirth in the breasts of those who have some knowledge of the Far East. Nevertheless it is true. Korea for fifteen centuries had been claimed as tributary to China, but in the middle of the seventh century A.D. its conquest was definitely achieved, and for some nine hundred years from that time

the Koreans shared in the artistic progress of their masters. The tie which bound them to the Dragon Throne was indeed slender enough, but the Koreans seem to have been sufficiently intelligent to admire and imitate Chinese handicrafts while as yet the Japanese were more concerned with swords and spears than with delicate cups or decorated caskets. Korean immigrants, however, sowed the seed which the Japanese abundantly watered. It fell too on fruitful soil, and the flower was one of great beauty. But whatever may be the truth as to the hotly contested merits of Japanese and Chinese art, there can be no doubt as to the fact that Korea was the connecting link between Japan and the earlier developed empire on the mainland.

Under these circumstances it is impossible for an educated Japanese not to feel a deep interest in Korea. Even at the present day Korean influence can be traced in many a Japanese palace and temple. At the Shiba Temples in the capital one of the most perfect bronze gates is the handiwork of Korean artificers. The visitor to Kyoto may see some of the best and earliest specimens of wooden statuary in Japan at the Temple of Koryuji. These are nearly all Korean. The finest, a gilt figure, has been restored by Japanese, and the result is an image of gold on feet of clay. It was the Japanese who made the feet. In the neighbourhood of Nara are wall paintings by Koreans better than any the Japanese could produce, and the best wood carving in the country—also Korean—is to be found at Kobukuji, in the same vicinity. Not every one knows or cares about the dark Korean pottery still made at Koishiwara, but there are few who do not admire the beautiful crackled faience familiar to us as Satsuma ware. The commonest of this is imported into Europe; very fine examples can still be procured in Japan, but they are modern. The splendid old Japanese Satsuma, lightly decorated, is probably not to be obtained for love or money, though expert Japanese collectors travel all over the world in search of stray specimens. And yet this was only an imitation of the work of seventeen families of Korean potters whom the Prince of Satsuma introduced in 1598, and whose descendants still live and labour at the village of Tsuboya, in that province. Strangely enough, Satsuma, where alone the Koreans still survive, is the one portion of Japan where the religion introduced by their forefathers is not tolerated.

Connected with these potters of Koishiwara and Tsuboya is the story of Hideyoshi's conquest of Korea at the end of the sixteenth century. They represent the only benefit conferred on Japan by a campaign which turned Korea into the most distressful country of the Far East. In the course of centuries the Koreans had suffered many vicissitudes. They seem to have been alternately conquered by Japan and China, while always retaining their own king and practical independence. They paid tribute to both countries, pur-

suing their own course with a careless disregard of the double yoke they were supposed to bear. But Hideyoshi determined to alter this state of affairs. He shared the opinion of Chuai's empress as to the power to which Korea owed allegiance, and he conceived the notion of conquering that country first and China afterwards. 'I shall do it all as easily,' he said, 'as a man rolls up a piece of matting and carries it under his arm.' It was done so far as Korea was concerned, but not easily. The campaign dragged on year after year. A mound near the Great Buddha at Kyoto bears grim testimony to the number of Koreans slain. But the Japanese invaders were also decimated and worn out; they erected their mound, they introduced the potters mentioned above, and they left Korea desolate and ruined. Originally the source of all that was best in Japanese civilisation, it has remained a land of desolation and semi-barbarism from then till now. Hideyoshi had committed the sin of Orestes, but without the provocation. It is only after the lapse of three centuries that Japan has fully realised that the act was an act of madness which it is her mission, if from no other motive than self-interest, to efface.

The importance of Korea to Japan in modern times lies in the fact that the population of the latter country is rapidly growing. After a certain stage is reached this always means three things—emigration, export of manufactured articles, import of raw materials and food. At first the Japanese emigrants, who can readily adapt themselves to western conditions of life, found a refuge in the United States, Canada, Australia, and Hawaii. They are good labourers provided they get an occasional holiday, but their white rivals soon discovered that Japanese cheap labour was only a degree less ruinous than the competition of the Chinese. The white men objected most strongly to the influx, and legislation followed in respect of all these countries which had the effect of rendering it difficult for the Japanese to establish themselves in the bosom of the Anglo-Saxon race. The Japanese Government protested, and still protests, against the restrictions imposed, but the white man all the world over has a horror of Asiatic complexions in connection with his own job, and the Japanese are by this time well aware that if they are to colonise at all they must colonise among the yellows and the blacks. It is highly tempting here to speculate on the influence that the Japanese Eurasian may some day exercise on this problem in a period when perhaps the Japanese race will have been improved by intermarriage with Europeans beyond all recognition, but this would be a digression from which it would be difficult to return. It must suffice to note the fact that the effect of growing population combined with foreign restrictive legislation has been to make Japan look towards the mainland on the west. There she has marked out two localities which she regards as her legitimate spheres. One is Fokien, facing the island of Formosa; the other is Korea. It will be remembered that

Korea formed the pretext of the war with China, and the first article of the Treaty of Peace signed at Shimonoseki runs as follows: 'China recognises definitely the full and complete independence and autonomy of Korea, and in consequence the payment of tribute and performance of ceremonies and formalities by Korea to China in derogation of such independence and autonomy shall wholly cease for the future.'

This treaty was signed in 1895, and since then the Japanese have spent much thought and money on Korea. Already in Seoul, the capital, 5 per cent. of the population are Japanese. At Chemulpho the proportion is probably higher. At Fusan there is a flourishing Japanese settlement, and the Japanese are rapidly increasing in other important towns. They have obtained by pressure or purchase the concessions for the Seoul-Chemulpho and Seoul-Fusan railways; they have mining concessions at Chiksan, Changsan, Songhwa (gold), Cholwan (iron), Phyongyang (anthracite), and more at several other places. They have whaling rights connected with three provinces; they conduct the Post and Telegraph services; they maintain nearly twenty schools, and as many Buddhist missionaries; they have undertaken and nearly completed the foreshore reclamations at Chemulpho, Mokpho, Kumsanpho, and Masanpho; they own half the banking establishments, have built a mint, and keep the Treasury funds, though the latter is not what a London banker would term a good-account. It is needless to add, therefore, that their political and commercial stake in the country is very great, especially as the above list by no means exhausts the limits of their enterprise. Russia, on the other hand, has three almost worthless coal-mining concessions, a branch bank, a Greek Church priest who baptises all and sundry, some whaling rights, the valuable privilege of felling trees in certain districts, some land privately acquired at Chinanpho, and a coaling station at Masanpho in default of another to which Japan successfully raised objection last year. Her influence at Court is considerable, but no case is on record of its having prevailed in opposition to that of the Japanese.

So much for Japanese enterprise in Korea. The service Korea renders to Japan is proportionate. In the first place Korea supplies Japanese merchants with an important and growing market. The extent of the imports from Japan is not to be measured by the needs of the 30,000 Japanese settlers alone, because each Japanese is a propagandist of his native customs, which are readily copied by the people among whom he resides. Hence it is not surprising to find that in the year 1899, for example, out of 1,666 steamers entering Korean ports 1,159 were Japanese, and that of their aggregate tonnage 602,227 out of 746,000 tons were credited to Japan. Not only is the carrying trade entirely in the hands of the Japanese, but the internal trade also is under their control. Mr. Jordan in his Report on Korea for 1899 says that the Japanese understand far

better how to deal with the Koreans even than the Chinese, from which statement the position of other traders may be easily inferred. It is difficult to tabulate the exact amounts of Japanese imports into Korea, but if we take the principal port, Chemulpho, as an example we find that while British goods perhaps constitute rather less than a quarter of the total imports in value Japanese goods are certainly rather more, and it is probable that they amount to something like a half. Japan sends to Chemulpho shirtings, cotton piece goods, yarn, sheetings, kerosene, matches, spirits, silk piece goods, and other things to the annual value of about 140,000*l*. And Korea sends practically all her exports to Japan, who presumably discharges Korean debts to other countries with her own exports. Of Korean exports to the total value of half a million sterling Japan absorbs sixty-eight per cent. in rice and beans alone. The value of the former was returned by Mr. Jordan at 141,785*l*. for 1899, and of the latter at 197,477*l*. These commodities are of vital importance to Japan; they represent the food supply of a large portion of her population; and the fact that Korean beans are being cut out by those from Manchuria, while Japanese trade is rapidly increasing in that country, does not simplify the question of how much Russian aggression Japan will feel willing to tolerate in Korea, but rather complicates it. In 1899 no less than 93 per cent. of the exports from Niuchwang were taken by Japan, while in the Manchurian carrying trade they are fast supplanting our own countrymen.

Such being the history and present condition of Japan's relations with Korea, there forces itself on the attention of the Japanese people the awkward fact that Russia desires to absorb that fertile but backward country. Apart from Russia's jealous desire to weaken Japan it is easy to see that Korea divides Port Arthur from Vladivostock for naval purposes. Russian men-of-war, to go from one to the other, must pass through the Korean Strait, where the Japanese island of Tsushima threatens them, as has been pointed out, like a second Gibraltar. Who is going to obtain possession of the Korean Ceuta? Russia answered this question when she took Port Arthur, for by so doing she threw her shoe over the wall. But Japan has not acknowledged that it admits of this answer only. It is probable that the Japanese are not easily influenced by ingenious phrases. They do not understand the soothing significance of 'geographical gravitation'; they are prone to interpret agreements and treaties in their obvious sense; and as for assurances, they are utterly lost upon them. Here, then, is a clear conflict of interests as regards Russia and Japan. To the former Korea is a stumbling-block on the path of empire; to the latter she is one of the columns on which the national edifice is supported. It seems so obvious that the issue must be decided by the sword sooner or later that, were a Japanese Bismarck to arise, it is almost certain he would take the earliest convenient

opportunity of presenting the Russian minister with his papers. It is rumoured, indeed, that more than once during the last two years Japan has threatened Russia, and to any one who watches Japanese politics closely it is apparent that such threats would be very seriously meant. Even during the last twelve months a notable and ominous change has occurred in Japanese public opinion as to how far Russia should be permitted to advance towards the Sea of Japan. A few extracts from the Japanese Press will help to make this point clear.

In December 1899 one of the leading Tokyo papers wrote as follows:

What Japan wants in Korea is not the acquisition of any territorial power but merely the protection of her industrial and commercial interests, to the expansion of which Russia has expressly recorded her pledge not to interpose any opposition. Japan wants to have the territorial integrity of Korea respected by, and her doors kept open to, all nations, and on these points too Russia has repeatedly signified her complete agreement. It will thus be seen that, so far as we can judge from the known desires of Japan and the officially expressed intentions of Russia, there is no fundamental conflict of opinion between the two Powers on the Korean question.

This represents one phase of instructed Japanese opinion at that date. But many took another view, which was clearly set forth by the *Jimmin* a few months later. 'It is well understood by the Japanese,' said that journal, 'that even in the event of their victory over the Russians they would not be able to deal a blow at the latter in Europe, and that should the contest be prolonged the financial strain would be too much for them to bear.' In accordance with this conviction the *Nippon* had already urged that Japan should abandon all opposition to Russia in the north, holding that Japan's natural line of expansion lay southwards in Fokien, and there alone. But the *Jimmin* had invented another way out of the difficulty. 'The only solution,' it said, 'which will satisfy Japan will be the complete withdrawal of Russian political influence from the peninsula, leaving the latter under the sole care and guidance of this country (Japan), in return for Japan's entire abstinence from interference with Russian activity in Northern China.' This suggestion, though on the face of it a temporising one, deserves careful attention, because it was, and is still, approved by many in Japan. The project of the *Nippon* was laughed to scorn. 'To maintain our position in China,' wrote the *Japan Times*, 'and to prevent Korea from falling into hostile hands, such undoubtedly has been and still is the fundamental idea of Japan's policy in the Far East.'

In July of last year the Korean question suddenly became acute, owing to the Russian action in Manchuria. The *Jimmin* continued to advocate a free hand for Russia in Manchuria, in return for Japanese liberty of action in Korea; but nearly all the other

journals, including the *Fiji Shimpō*, the *Chugai Shogyō*, and the *Chuo*, openly urged the Government to occupy Korea with a military force. The comparative reticence of semi-official newspapers like the *Nichi Nichi Shimbun* and of the influential *Kokumin Shimbun* was no less significant than these outspoken utterances. One Tokyo newspaper, which is supposed to enjoy a large measure of official confidence, besought its readers to remain calm on these two grounds: (1) that Russia was far weaker than generally supposed; and (2) that when the time for action came those in authority would leave nothing undone that Japan could do.

The nation's temper was rising. A month more and the *Nippon* itself had been carried away with the stream. We hear no more of expansion in Fokien and the south; on the contrary, that journal calls upon Japan to ignore her agreement with Russia as to not sending troops to Korea except by mutual consent, and to establish a military occupation without delay. Once more the *Jimmin* is found true to its original policy. It will not hear of Korea being made a buffer State. The Korean peninsula, it declares, is a perpetual annoyance: 'the further continuance of this source of international friction is unendurable for Japanese statesmen, and it is presumable that the Russian diplomatists are also profoundly sensible of the dangers attending the continuance of the present state of things.' Let Japan, it continues, take Korea, and as for Manchuria, Russia is welcome to try her hand at civilising it.

One more extract may be given; it is the sort of thing men say when they are prepared to fight. 'Whether Korean integrity were guaranteed by two Powers, as it is at present, or by more than two, as proposed' (sc. by Mr. Ryu Koizuka), 'it would not matter much, for practically Japan is the only Power which is sufficiently interested in the matter to see to the strict observance of the guarantee by Russia. In a word, the matter lies between Japan and Russia alone, and if any permanent and peaceful solution is possible it should be sought in a mutual understanding between them alone. We sincerely hope that such an understanding will not be impossible, but in any case it seems clear that in settling the Korean question with Russia the Japanese cannot count upon the active co-operation of any third Power.'

During the last three months affairs in Manchuria have been growing more critical from a Japanese point of view. Marquis Yamagata dissolved his ministry on the express ground that the situation demanded one man above all others to take the helm, and that man was the Marquis Ito. He, we are told, has been endeavouring to moderate the excitement of his countrymen. How inflammable the public mind now is may be judged from the fact that on the 17th of February last an assemblage of over three thousand people was dispersed by the police at the mere mention of the Manchurian

railway, for fear of a breach of the public peace, and a smaller political gathering was similarly broken up on the same day when one of the speakers alluded to Russia. And what has Marquis Ito to say to his countrymen at this crisis? What is his message of peace and consolation? Addressing his followers on the 26th of March last, he is reported to have said that Japan had attained a position enabling her to protect her legitimate interests and to take whatever steps were required by the exigencies of any situation. He added that it was impossible to deny that Japan felt the influence of the complication connected with her neighbour, or to ignore the clouds on the horizon. Marquis Ito is not a man who willingly takes the people into his confidence. In fact, he scarcely conceals from his audiences that he regards them as untrained children, and he adopts much the same tone towards them as did a former Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs towards the rest of the House of Commons. Hence the above speech is the more significant.

The despatch of relief troops to Seoul three months before the usual time, together with three officers of the head-quarters staff, and the reported activity in Japanese arsenals at the present moment, may be interpreted as signs that Japan realises the importance of being in earnest. The establishment of a torpedo boat station at Moji and the curious movements of Japanese and Russian men-of-war in Korean waters seem to point to the same conclusion. From all quarters of the globe we are now being enlightened as to what Japan has been saying to Russia and what Russia has been saying in reply. But we are not concerned here to bring the story of their differences up to the date of this morning's paper or to appreciate the latest rumour from Shanghai or Washington. Enough has been said to show that the difficulty to be faced by both empires is a very real one, and to the ordinary mind only one solution, and that a terrible one, seems possible, whatever temporary arrangement may be made about Manchuria.

'There is a land to the westward, and in that land is abundance of treasure, gold and silver, dazzling to look upon. This land I will now bestow upon you.'

So prophesied the inspired empress to her consort seventeen centuries ago. And he pushed away his lute and said, 'They are lying spirits who have spoken to you.' Then the god was filled with anger and the empress prophesied again, saying, 'You are not fit to rule this empire. Go the one road!'

The emperor was stricken with sudden death, and after she had done her work the empress also died. But, being dead, she still speaks to those of her own nation, while the fate of the emperor is not forgotten.

H. N. G. BUSHBY.

THE BLUNDER OF MODERN EDUCATION

IN these days of unexampled international competition, when, on the one hand, England has reached a stage of her Imperial development that must inevitably make great demands upon the British race, while, on the other, we are compelled to acknowledge ourselves far inferior to our great rivals in educational equipment for the impending commercial struggle, the question must force itself upon us: Whence comes this obvious waste of educational effort and of the material it serves to manufacture? It is a question which must come to the forefront now that we stand upon the threshold, not so much of a new century—for that merely signifies a mechanical calculation of time—as of a new era in political and social life. And it is one that cannot be shirked if the Anglo-Saxon race is to survive in the struggle of the nations, and to accomplish the great mission which some of the most far-seeing world politicians have ascribed to it.

The assertion that our entire system of education is totally wrong from beginning to end will probably scandalise both the conventional Conservative and the progressive-minded Educationalist. The vast majority of people either cling to the conviction that the system itself is adequate, or believe that its principles only require extension to meet the growing necessities of a rapid increase in population and commercial competition. Such persons can be induced to tinker with the existing machinery, but they are unable to grasp the idea that the whole foundations of our educational system are absolutely false in principle; that most of the great educationalists and teachers of the past have expended their genius in building up this system upon altogether wrong lines; and that their efforts have had the effect of retarding, instead of encouraging, the intellectual development of the race. The greatest obstacle to human progress that evolution has to encounter is this mental conventionality, which is the direct product of a system of education that aims at creating a uniform type of mind. Thousands of young men and women are turned out every year by our schools and universities upon an exact pattern, like sausages from a Chicago factory. Each is provided with precisely the same stock of know-

ledge, and consequently the market becomes overcrowded with enormous numbers of workers all trained to perform the same set of functions. The number of university graduates who sink into poverty and obscurity has often been remarked upon by persons who have made a special study of cheap lodging-houses and their inmates. What is the explanation of this circumstance? Is it because education is in itself an ineffectual preparation for the actualities of life? Or are the subjects taught in our schools and universities useless and unprofitable of themselves? The answer is that education is an indispensable preparation for any kind of efficient work, but that it must be education applied in a sensible and logical manner. The curriculum itself probably contains all the subjects that may be necessary or useful. It is not what is taught that is ridiculous, but the cramming of each individual with the identical stock of knowledge possessed by his neighbour, without regard to his personal taste and capacity.

Let us take the case of the average well-educated man. He is born, we will suppose, of parents whose means just enable them to give him the best obtainable education, but do not suffice to render him independent of earning his own livelihood. At the age of five, probably earlier, he is taught to read and write. Half a dozen years are then spent in preparing him, by a conventional course of elementary study, for a public school. He is sent to the latter at eleven or twelve, and remains there until he is twenty or thereabouts. During this period he is crammed with precisely the same information as the other boys. His recreations are practically organised for him, and he acquires uniform habits of mind with his companions. When he leaves, the school has stamped upon him a common individuality shared by all his schoolfellows. This process is then continued at the university. He enters with hundreds of other young men upon a certain course with a fixed object—the taking of his degree. The same kind of inflexible routine is conscientiously gone through, and his mind thoroughly flavoured with the university sauce which is to identify him throughout life. By the time he has graduated—not only in book knowledge, but in manners, habits of dress, thought, and everything else—his parents have done all they can for him. He has now to choose a career for himself. Feeling no call to the Church, he elects to go in for the Civil Service competitive examinations. Then follows the greatest of all educational crimes—the stuffing of the brain with so much knowledge *avoir-dupois*. He muffs at everything, however, and, having no taste for the law and being, absolutely unfitted for business, he tries to make a living by his pen. Hundreds of others, he finds, are in a similar plight and are trying to do the same thing. But here, if anywhere, the defects of his training become conspicuous. Journalism wants ideas. He can only offer good grammar, a style founded upon the

Latin syntax, and some classical ornamentation. There is no market, he discovers, for these commodities. They may be excellent accessories, but they are to be found, like the Masters of Arts who pen them, at every street corner. So, being equally unfitted by reason of his grammatical accomplishments for cheap reporting on the daily Press, he drags on a miserable and immoral existence as a university coach, helping others to the same unhappy state of existence into which he has himself fallen. By the time he has arrived at middle age, he begins to discover that the world is not very well ordered; a fact which he probably ascribes to some defect in the political system. An exceptionally gifted man, even at this mature period, sometimes succeeds in shaking off the parasitic traces of his early training. But for the average person it is too late; and it is even doubtful if he ever realises that he is the victim, not of a cruel and callous world, but of an idiotic system of education specially designed to fit the smallest possible number for survival.

The whole theory upon which our educational method is based is, in fact, utterly absurd and hopelessly unsuited to the ordinary conditions of life. If we wish to establish a rational system, we must go to the root of the evil and build up an entirely new edifice upon fresh foundations. The modern method of bringing up children, in the first instance, completely stunts their educational growth; and the process of teaching to which they are subjected at too early an age succeeds in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred in merely checking their intellectual development; while the final touch of the university—unless it be happily escaped—deals it the *coup de grâce* in the most approved fashion. The mischief really commences, therefore, with early childhood. It has found its origin in the stupidity of parents, due of course to the cast-iron conventionality which has been forced upon them from youth upwards, warping all tendency to independent and rational thought. But of late years the State, equally hide-bound from precisely the identical causes, has stepped in and translated this parental ignorance into an Act of Parliament. It is now actually an offence against the law to give a child a proper chance of developing the faculties with which evolution has been trying, in its struggle against the imbecility of mankind, to endow the human race. The moment an infant has learnt enough words to enable it to form ideas, down swoops the State (or, in better classes of society, the parent or guardian) and hands it over to the pedagogue to manufacture its thoughts and force its mind into conventional channels. This wicked proceeding stops the natural growth of the mind. Genius and originality, both of which exist potentially in the unsophisticated child, are eradicated with a perversity that is almost malicious. If not utterly and wantonly destroyed, they are kept under and discouraged, until, like all disused faculties, they finally disappear of their own accord. At the age of

five, children begin to develop powers of observation. If left alone, or merely encouraged to exercise this function in their own way, children will contract the habit of thinking things out for themselves. How many grown-up people do this? The whole science of life as we practise it consists in using substitutes for individual reflection. Novelists save us the trouble of philosophising on our own account about human nature; the Press provides us with manufactured opinions on all the topics of the day; the pulpit bolsters up our religious beliefs with ready-made arguments. It is all the result of our early training; and the wonder is that people can be found to express any new ideas at all. On this fatal plan the youth of the nation is brought up. Original thought is methodically nipped in the bud; and with the first initiation into the mysteries of the alphabet commences an organised attempt to infuse into every child's brain the same heritage of conventional, thought-paralysing facts.

As far as the bringing up of young children is concerned, the remedy is obvious. Until they have reached the age of seven years, at the least, children must not receive any instruction at all. The duty of the School Attendance Officer should be reversed. It ought to be his function to see, not that children attend school at a certain age, but that they do not attend before attaining a minimum number of years, which might be fixed at seven or even more. Such a prohibition would undo a vast amount of evil, although parents would of course be free to act as they pleased in their own homes. Doubtless it would take a generation or more to get rid of conventional notions respecting the teaching of children; but if the State set the necessary example, common sense would in the end prevail against case-hardened stupidity. By this means a chance would be given to children to show the bent of their minds. Anybody who has had much to do with children will know that there is a wonderful development of curiosity and speculation regarding almost everything in the universe between the ages of five and seven. Education should consist in encouraging and fostering it, instead of in diverting the brain into the channels of the common-place. The teaching of elementary subjects ought to be applied tentatively and with great caution, the main objective of the teacher being to allow the mind to expand as much as possible outside of reading, writing, and arithmetic. It should be remembered that the first of these subjects is too apt to supply a substitute for original reflection, while the other two are more or less mechanical exercises of the brain and hand. Primary education should, in fact, be limited to the fewest possible subjects. Reading, writing, history, and the native language would form a sufficient basis upon which to rest the foundations of individual development.

Our existing school system consists in lumping together masses of school children in what are called classes, and stuffing into their

heads collectively a quantity of knowledge based, not upon the individual bent of each child, but upon a fixed code and curriculum. The principle is to set forty or fifty children doing and thinking precisely the same thing. The result is inevitable. There is a top of the class and a bottom of the class. Those who reach the former are regarded as the clever ones; those who remain at the latter are looked upon as dunces. The classification is wholly unfair and grossly idiotic. All that it really reveals is the perniciousness of a system which creates stupid children by forcing upon their brains subjects for which they are not receptive. The fool of the Latin class might distinguish himself in natural history; but the pedagogue goes on stuffing him with syntax and grammar, regardless of the fact that his mind is absorbed in beetles, and that he never attends school without a pocketful of mice. Not only must this method of teaching *en bloc* be abolished altogether, but teaching in itself, as we understand the term, should be rigorously avoided. Every encouragement ought to be given to pupils to think. There should be less reading and more reflection. The pernicious custom of learning by rote ought to be inscribed upon the penal code. Hanging would be too light a punishment for the teacher who destroyed the minds of his charges by making them commit *Caagabianca* to memory. It is not the duty of the schoolmaster to drone out set lessons to a class, but to get into touch with each pupil and to assist the development of his individuality. Teachers should not lead, but follow. It should be their function to discover the natural bent of each child, and to shape its course of study accordingly. The minds of children cannot be developed to full advantage under a compulsory and uniform method. The aim of education should be to get the best out of each individual, and not to obtain an average of mediocrity. This result can only be attained by differential treatment, not by wholesale cramming on a cast-iron system. In Germany some attempt, it is true, is made in the direction of specialisation. But it is made too late. The uniform type of young man is first produced by the conventional method, and specialisation is grafted on at the end of the process. It is a half-measure which retains the erroneous principles of education, whilst making a lame effort to counter-balance some of the evils they serve to produce. But the results, as the last quarter of the century has shown, are at least very much in advance of what we are attaining in this country.

In fact, without descending to personalities, it may be pointed out that England has never felt more acutely than during the past eighteen months the want of great men. There are hundreds of conventionally educated, uniform-patterned, honourably-intentioned mediocrities to grace our public service upon ordinary occasions, capable, at the outside, to use Lord Rosebery's famous phrase, of muddling out right in the end. But in times of national emergency

we have need of exceptional talent and commanding force of character. We cannot boast a liberal supply of this material. There are some who might have possessed these qualities; but their education has handicapped them. The imagination was killed in early childhood; ideas have been allowed no room to expand; the mind has been forced to remain within rigid limits, like a fowl's beak bent to a chalk line. The enormous expenditure of public money upon the production of machine-made human automata is sheer waste. It is at the bottom of half the social problems that are perplexing statesmen all over the globe, and is wholly responsible for a disastrous form of intellectual competition beside which commercial rivalry sinks into insignificance. Even if we grapple with the evil at once, generations may pass before its effects cease to exercise a baleful influence on the lives of thousands of capable men and women. But if we neglect to grasp the nettle now, to institute a close time for the development of ideas and to educate the youth of the nation on principles of common sense, posterity will suffer in a way that even we, who drive our scholars to the workhouse, are scarcely in a position to realise to the full extent.

HAROLD E. GORST.

OUR RACE AS PIONEERS

WHAT is our position, and what are our necessities ?

One thing we may be certain of : if the Creator had any purpose in creation, all must be working according to His will for definite ends, and man is only the agent.

There is nothing material or visible in which the law of Movement is not discernible : whether what we understand by progress is visible or not, we may be justified in believing that all is working to a definite end. Is it too fanciful to believe that an equally definite law directs and governs the acts of men and States ? States rise when there is work for them to do on the planet, and fall when they have accomplished their work or have proved themselves incapable of it.

Man's position is distinctly marked out in the Great Ancient Story—'There was not a man to till the ground !' All had been set in order, it was all good, growth and evolution eternally provided for, but an agent was required to keep the machinery in motion ; as the earthworm was wanted to break up the soil, so man was wanted to till the ground. Not to till it merely by scratching it up with the plough, but by clearing the jungle, irrigating the arid waste, controlling the torrent, draining the swamp, and extirpating destructive reptiles and insects. The agent, Man, was wanted. He is a necessity.

What the earth would be without his work may be illustrated and proved by what it has become in the once fertile Campagna of Rome, which now through neglect is uninhabitable and poisonous.

It is certain that modern civilisation has not brought with it all virtue and happiness, but it makes a better state of things possible, and has made clearer the perception of right and wrong, to be hereafter fruitful of general good. In our ever probing onward, seeming to be so absolutely selfish, we, the English people, are perhaps the agents of the great law—Movement, Progress, Evolution.

This theme and what it implies is hateful to many thinkers with much apparent reason, but in the present effect our work is that of the pioneer, who, forcing his way through the jungle, destroys many beautiful flowers, while at the same time he prepares the soil by letting in light and air, and affords the means of the desired

development. The whole earth is now required for the increasing multitudes with their manifold conditions; but the races are not proportionally developing in physical properties. This pioneering is carrying out the purpose of the great Lord of the soil, whose labourers work without knowledge of His fixed intention.

The 'Great Scheme' may be subject to changes such as govern human conditions, where all is movement, change, mutability; mutability, which means the immutability of permanence, which is vitality, which the very changes perfect. Reflection, therefore, will not permit the conclusion that the forces which govern human conditions are distinct from, and outside the government of, the Divine regulation of the material forces of nature.

It is in accordance certainly with every sect of Christianity to believe that a ruling Power exists, which takes cognisance of, governs, and consequently limits, human actions. That being so, it is no great stretch of imagination to believe that the decreed purpose is given to men to work out: conscience and experience directing for good; and indifference, recklessness, and evil intention culminating in disaster. It is as much a responsibility, and culpable, to neglect conscience and experience in individuals and nations, as it is indolently to neglect acting upon the principles of evolution when we have become conscious of the law, and as certain to be punished by loss of great vital powers in individuals and place in nations, as by conscious vice. Surely we may say, then, that it is not fanciful to trace the rise and fall of empires to the same law that regulates all things, from the precession of the equinoxes to the circulation of the blood. All this science makes us acquainted with the constitutional construction of physics in nature. It cannot, then, be a very extravagant flight of imagination to see in nations this great law at work, directing a purpose. The tangible and intangible alike may be for a purpose; but one thing is certain—all that has a beginning has an end, the end always coming from internal decay in the case of organisms, and most apparent in empires, where it is always brought about by the decay of the qualities that gave them birth and held them up.

'They also serve who only stand and wait' can scarcely be applicable here. Civilisation admits of no standing still; there can be no loitering in Fleet Street, for the policeman's 'Move on' would soon make itself heard.

The law of expansion is the law of vitality, and consequently of humanity, broken down it may be in one place and stretched in another—for it is certain that civilisation so lurches out of the real line of march as to make us absolutely regret a ruder time; but our efforts at civilisation, even when they fail, still clear the way for further civilisation, the only road by which better things may be reached.

Civilisation is like a flood, a mighty overwhelming flood, not so

much caused by storms, or even the onward rolling of the great ocean, but by the welling up of the mighty mass of waters from beneath, forcing its way over the earth, steadily and perceptibly rising; and unless outlets be found and channels created (whereby it may be made beneficial and irrigatory), it will submerge much that is fair and worthy of permanence.

The great empires would seem to be tools in the hand of the mighty Designer, they do their work and carry activity into waste places. When, as tools, they have done all they can be useful for, or become unfit for the work, these tools that the Designer has made are thrown aside, to be replaced by others better adapted to the shaping or to the occasion.

Great social and political movements are the outcome of circumstances, over which individuals, and even communities, seem to have little control, while they are only instrumental in shaping events. So Rome had to conquer Carthage, to make laws and roads and open the way for civilisation. This, Carthage would never have done.

Carthage had great fighters and captains, but she would never have taken a lead in progress. The empires of antiquity fell when they ceased to aid progress; many barriers forbade advance, which time and progress have now removed.

We do not know much about the States overrun by the Israelites in taking possession of Palestine, but it is probable they were degraded by superstition and debased by ease.

The words of Balaam prove that he saw in the compact and disciplined host before him qualities against which his countrymen would be unable successfully to contend.

Greece went as far as conditions permitted her great intellectual powers to go, and felt the check. Egypt, Babylon, Nineveh, Carthage, Rome, and Jerusalem decayed, and were succeeded by others better fitted to carry on the work.

Perhaps the present state of things in China may imply that by the law that demands progress the hour is come for the change by outward pressure which it refuses to make by internal effort. The Chinese Empire presents us with the unique fact in known history of a nation remaining at the same point without progress or decay. This condition could not have been possible but for the geographical position of China, neither surrounded by active and aspiring peoples nor a highroad to anywhere.

This is why we must be in South Africa, and later not we alone, but Germany and Russia, working to one end; and regarding the present war in the light of personal or even of merely national interest to ourselves would be looking at it from a superficial though natural point of view—instead of this, we should look at it from the point of view at issue. It is really a war in the interests of civilisation, and so regards not merely ourselves, but the world at large, for many a long year.

Our conflict with the Boers may be explained as the outcome of that law which says 'Forward!' The Boers stop the way—they are unprogressive; though a fine, manly race they stand still, they are like children; children are delightful people, but they cannot stand all day and idle in the stream, while the stress and strife of the highway goes on beside them. A childish people with child-like merits and childish credulity, having a child's idea of religion, a creed of 900 years B.C. The Old Testament alone seems to be their Bible, for, with all their Puritanical religious sentiments, they are terribly wanting in Christian gentleness.

They are a pastoral people. The pastoral life may be a beautiful one, but it is not a progressive one. It may be likened to a lovely island in the midst of a turbulent ocean, an oasis in a savage waste, which could never exist in these modern times of unrest. A pastoral community is delightful, certainly, but impossible in Cheapside. The greatest friends and admirers of the Boers represent them as a primitive and pastoral people. Some may say, 'Nothing can be more desirable than such a state;' it may be so, but nevertheless it is an impossible one, rendered impossible by the advance of knowledge, the wants created, and the activity thereby engendered in these days of restlessness and increased necessities. There can be no inactivity. The pastoral life of the Boers is an anachronism.

The intention was that man should reap the product of infinite development; thus, when man becomes a member of a highly complicated state in which the consequent necessities oblige radiating activity, a merely pastoral state, however innocent and delightful, becomes impossible. No peoples can live unmolested on the face of the earth if they do not move with the current. Investigation proves that movement and progress are a Divine law; the Boer ignores this law—he only wishes to be quiet. During his occupation of the land he has hardly cleared or irrigated it. He has done nothing, and from his character is not likely to do anything, for literature, science, or art. He has produced no poem or Volkslied, made no contribution to discovery, or even to the natural history he has had such opportunities of studying—in fact, contributed nothing to progress. Wholly unproductive.

His place in the army of real Freedom and Progress is vacant. The necessary elements for creating a great nationality are not to be found in him; and even if he were to become master of the immense tract of South Africa, that tract would be lost to civilisation until the Great Law gave it over to some active nationality.

Having the qualities of a primitive people, the Boers might live happily on some small island, but in their place as rulers cannot appreciate an immense tract of the globe. Some active and progressive people must replace them, and at present no people seem better fitted to do it than we are.

The Boers are a crafty people, in many respects semi-civilised. Even sympathisers with them tell us that, in spite of their heroic determination to enter into a conflict so unequal, they are not only unprogressive but have degenerated from their Dutch ancestors. Indolence is one of their characteristics, which they seem to have inherited from the animal nature by which they are surrounded, and the savage peoples they have dispossessed.

We notice in the Boers the Homeric character of their fighting qualities, but with it an absence of poetic sense and love of beauty; the courage of Achilles without his splendour, without the grace of the heroic pupil of Chiron. Crafty as Ulysses, without his sense or appreciation of beauty, which obliged the warrior (knowing he could not trust himself) to make his mariners tie him to the mast, when passing the Sirens, lest he should be powerless to resist their charms. A defect certainly, but one that in a nation gives it not only a Shakespeare and a Wordsworth, but the stimulant to exertion outside mere animal enjoyment and success.

It may seem arrogant to say the Earth is made for those who can bring out its possibilities, but at any rate we must obey the demands of our necessities. We have no more right than others, but we have greater necessities. What is our right? The right that the inevitable imposes upon us. The light of Truth shall set the face of Judgment severely straight.

As a nation we have been more than any other pioneers, and we may claim the right to be so, as long as we continue to be a nation. Our work is necessary even if, being experimental, it does not appear to be all for good. We watch the minute-hand on the dial-plate, but do not know the hour. We are but as tools in the hands of the unthinkable Designer, for the working out of, to us, an unseen great purpose.

History no doubt repeats itself, for the story of Humanity, physically and morally, is ever the same, and ever must be; yet, when needs which are the spring of action change, though no change takes place in the physical and moral state, passion and emotion exact as much elasticity as the law permits. History therefore presents no exact prototype of a modern state of things. Science, which by increasing our needs, real or fancied, has practically abolished Time and Space as formerly known, and placed at our disposal means of satisfying our real and fancied wants and of destroying what we dislike, has destroyed the exact parallel it formerly presented.

We know our solar system is impelled onwards, towards some point in space. Humanity seems to be subject to the same law, impelled by an irresistible impulse onward.

Many, seeing that progress and civilisation have not in all cases been an unmixed improvement, cry 'Let alone!' But 'Let alone!'

is not possible in these days. 'Forward' is the voice of the law. Therefore it is almost an altruistic duty to explain that we as a nation must obey and cannot help ourselves, and so, if possible, make ourselves better understood.

In the case of the Transvaal, rightful ownership to a whole country can hardly be established by a squatter of little more than fifty years' standing. We were there before the Dutch, and at best the claim of the Boers is the right of conquest, and by this right they demand the withdrawal of the British from the Transvaal. If we concede that as a right, we have the prior claim to it. More than one contribution on the subject has been published to our certain knowledge. In the *Times* issue for the 3rd of November, 1899, it is shown, and proved from records and dates, that our flag was planted in South Africa in 1620, long before the Dutch were there; that in all directions the territory was explored by successive Englishmen many years before the Boers were in the country at all.

The Boers are not the aborigines, or even discoverers—they are only squatters establishing themselves by conquest, and very savage conquest (on one occasion slaughtering three thousand of the natives without losing on their side a single man). They would not have maintained their position but for our aid, as, later, the native warriors would have swept them away. For that aid they accepted our suzerainty.

Our acknowledged right—the right of possession which first occupation of savage or unoccupied land gives—was resigned; and only when the Boers proved themselves incapable of governing with justice and sense did we again assert our right to step in, claiming justice (the same justice that we should have accorded Dutch settlers in an English colony) and securing it for the Uitlanders, who are mainly our subjects. Thus from our action we may conclude that we ourselves, when most successful, are but clearing the waste places for younger nations. Our envied possessions are only to pass to others. Labourers less for ourselves than for those who are waiting for the fruit of our labours to fall to them.

Our natural qualities seem to be those of a pioneering, enterprising people, adapting ourselves most naturally to differences of climate, not much bound by family or domestic ties or turning much to home—a questionable merit from a moral point of view, but marking us out for colonisation and as agents working for some future that we know nothing of and cannot foresee—really pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for the profit of others and so not deserving the envy of our possessions, which we only hold in trust.

The mission of pioneering seems to be forced upon us by a combination of circumstances.

The necessity of providing for an excess of population, which cannot be restrained by any means civilisation will allow—internal

The influx of aliens.—None would wish to shut these out. One of our greatest glories is the asylum, the freedom we offer, to even our enemies; but it increases our difficulties. The constant inflowing of strangers impels our already overflowing population abroad; and though we may seem to have no right anywhere out of our own little island, we are helplessly pushed forward, to make room for those pouring in from all parts of the world.

Our restricted area.—The space that must be found for our overflowing population gives a distinct reason to the active forward movement which looks like lust for conquest. What we want is a clear perception and sense of right that conscience should approve alone, and that conscience should be rigidly acted upon, and earnestly obeyed.

Inevitable social and political measures claim obedience which may be at variance with the spiritual and ethical conscience. The latter at this juncture may justify the Boers rather than us; but there comes in the question of necessity, apparent laws that contest with pure right and wrong. The virtues of Sparta were as fatal to the permanence of the State as the faults of Athens; the former barred the way to progress, while the latter gave progress a wrong direction.

Our good friends abroad, who do not see the necessity which is such a vital one to us, are of the same mind as Talleyrand, who, after repeated applications for help from his nephew, demurred; upon which the young man said, '*Mais il faut vivre,*' and Talleyrand made answer, '*Je ne vois pas la nécessité.*'

With our population of millions we cannot sit down and starve, and it is of no use to listen either to remonstrances or threats.

Our uncertain climate.—This in a far smaller degree, yet to some extent and under certain circumstances, necessitates our seeking more equable and settled conditions.

Our national characteristics.—These are the spirit of activity and enterprise and the love of commerce. The top that ceases to spin, falls. Nothing can stop us but the Leader's bâton thrown down (which would mean to us loss of the first place in the army of pioneers, which the Great Law has given us), and at any time it may appoint another Power to supersede us. The contributions the British people have made in the application of science, invention, and discovery to the use of mankind are greater perhaps than those of any other nation.

We are sometimes called a 'Nation of Shopkeepers,' which a nation that exists by commerce must be more or less, but we need not be a 'Nation of Sharpers.' If the shopkeeping element has been prominent, it has ceased to be especially characteristic or remarkable for active endeavour to profit at the expense of others.

We cannot be a conquering nation, and do not desire to be if we

could ; we cannot be an agricultural people—neither our space nor our climate will permit of it ; but as we must live, nothing remains but commerce.

Napoleon said, ' War cannot be made with rose-water ; ' and so commerce, as it is necessary to us, cannot be carried on without competition and pushing the limits of our interests. The result of competition can only be conflict—war—unless some other outlet can be found. Commerce will not supply this ; its very activity, which is its health and life, will produce the ambitious envy and jarring interests that will be as fatal to peace, as former mere love of power. The principle, movement, may in humanity be explained by impulse to activity ; it is as certain as in the solar systems, and must, being a natural law, have its safety-valve, its outlet. This has always been war. The advocates of peace think the competition of commerce will be the equivalent, but this accord will only be a temporary calm to the accumulating irritation of interests always threatening and preparing for war, inevitable war.

Unless the pressure can be diverted, commerce (except when on the co-operative system) will be as active in generating the fierce unrest as ever the lust of power has been, more sordid, and certainly not less destructive. The goddess Trade, the modern Pandora, has in her box all the evils that can affect mankind. The limelight of modern civilisation seems mainly to bring out the glitter of gold. At present the abolition of war is out of the question. How can commerce, as understood by the principles of trade, abolish it ?

The object of strife is only shifted, conflict is the law of vitality, but with the advance of knowledge the aim of the century should be to raise the standard of public morals and improve the condition of the population mentally and physically, thinking less of material things and more of those qualities which are in the long run sure to command even material advantages—a sane mind in a sane body.

Interest honourably prosecuted without intentional injury to other interests and rights, our enterprising and commercial activity need not excite alarms or excite jealousy in others. The simple principles of right and wrong are easily defined, and, like the quality of mercy, should not be strained ; but the complexity of human affairs and legitimate interests, conducing to the activity demanded by the great law—Movement—makes some elasticity necessary, even when there is the most honest desire to be just.

Every patriotic Englishman will be jealous for the future honour of his country, and will lay to heart Mr. Rudyard Kipling's ' Lest we forget,' but, while remembering and endeavouring to avoid self-conceit, will also endeavour to make constant and earnest efforts to keep abreast with the changes of the ' Old Order ' time brings about.

The rise and fall of nations being in accordance with the great law, empires look in history like the drops of water that fall from a

revolving wheel in a mill-stream. They glitter and drop off, replaced by others as the wheel turns, ever rising and falling, ever the same motion.

The undeniable loss of prestige, and the rancour exhibited by surrounding nations, make our position one of great peril, only to be met by some heroic impulse permeating all classes, such as the religious revivals of olden time or of the Turf now, when every gutter child feels a throb of excitement at the name of the favourite and the state of the odds! No doubt the fierce—it would be ungenerous to say malevolent—rivalry may be too much for any single Power to compete with, and we may lose all, for we shall lose all if we cease to be one of the dominant Powers. But even with all our faults we may look forward to the judgment of the future without fear. Ill-mannered and wholly wanting in foresight, our aspirations have never been ignoble, nor have we been cruel in carrying them out. We have been in the van of the army of progress and freedom; the principles of our criminal law have been carried to an extreme of tenderness, no man is accounted guilty till positive and material proof is established, no vengeance has followed failure, our door has always been open to the oppressed and miserable, and we have extended to all the freedom we believe to be a birthright; we have never denied benefits or forgotten generosity; and if we fall, it must be with the dignity of Cæsar arranging his robes.

A couple of lines taken from the prayer of Ajax in Pope's 'Homer' (always delightful to me as being the first book I ever read) run thus:

If we must perish, we thy will obey,
But let us perish in the light of day.

G. F. WATTS.

IS LAW FOR THE PEOPLE OR FOR THE LAWYERS?

Difficult to sweep the intricate foul chimneys of law.—CARLYLE.

THE imaginary difficulties that are unfairly pictured as arising in the way of a genuine reform of the practice and procedure of our Law Courts are sufficient to embarrass the lay mind. It is not surprising that many of His Majesty's subjects who are not lawyers are led, in desperation, to believe that there would be cheaper justice if we returned to the rule of the Roman Emperors, and our King-Emperor could set in motion the whole legislative power, at any rate for this purpose. Any one who ventures to attack the present system must be prepared to meet with more strenuous opposition of a direct, and particularly of an indirect, nature than in any other branch of life from those who are most conscious of, or are satisfied with, old evils, and from those who will not trouble to consider the matter in any other light than their own. The subject is one that has been discussed by many writers during the past half-century. I do not think that it has been approached by a lawyer solely from the people's point of view. If a man directs his attention to the profession of the law, but consistently keeps the interests of the public at all times in mind, he must be continually driven to entertain the unpleasant sentiment that our system is one that is still too flexible, and too easily put to uses that cause an unnecessary and unfair sacrifice of the savings of the community.

During the Victorian era, some of the useless expenses that were incurred over pure matters of form have been rendered impossible. But the great duty of the State to the people has not been performed, and the crowning work has been left for the present time. The procedure in our Courts and the form of our law have yet to be rendered simple, intelligible, and useful. History has shown a series of steps from time to time, always taken grudgingly and just sufficient to stifle the popular cry, but never providing the true reforms that the community have a right to demand. When we look at the enormous progress in every branch of science, and in the social, commercial, and industrial world, it is an unpleasant thing to be compelled to

confess that lawyers have not conscientiously attempted to keep pace with the times. Many will at once refer to the Judicature Acts and Rules. Although one of the steps in the right direction, they are emphatically a distinct failure in some important points, and particularly as regards the satisfactory reduction of the expense of litigation. Inefficacious in this respect, they are also, from a broad point of view, detrimental to the interests of the lawyers themselves. The weight has not been taken off the more modest litigants' back because the load has been shifted.

It must be admitted by every one that a cheaper form of procedure somehow or other must *ex necessitate rei* be introduced in order to meet the tendencies of the modern world. Lawyers have experienced the strong pressure of a certain portion of the public that could make its influence felt. The solid mercantile work was slipping away; and then—but mark! not till then—was it attempted to form a Court which, by way of wooing refractory litigants back again, is called the Commercial Court. So also, cases under what is known as Order XIV. are heard specially. But this limited Commercial Court for large and not for small matters is really beginning at the wrong end. The urgent need for reasonable expense is more felt by the great body of litigants, who are persons of moderate means, and who cannot bring the same pressure on the State or the lawyers. Both branches of the legal profession, barristers and solicitors, have been, and are, complaining of the slackness of work and of the character of what there is. They will continue to do so; for litigation will be likely to go on decreasing, particularly taking into consideration the increase in the population, until the public feel that they can settle their contentions without running the risk of incurring an outlay so outrageously out of proportion to the amount or value of the matter in dispute.

It is many years since Lord Chief Justice Willes said: Whatever you do, never go to law; submit rather to almost any imposition, bear any oppression, rather than exhaust your spirits and your pocket in what is called a court of justice. Matters have improved, but the advice is just as useful now. That it should be necessary to impress such words on the public mind is a blemish upon this country's escutcheon of liberty in an age of virtuous emulation in everything good and great. Justice is not ready to be meted out to every one, when it is placed beyond the means of some and rendered unacceptable or vexatious to others in consequence of the risk of unreasonable expense. Moreover, there is little real justice done if the party in whose favour the judgment is given finds that he has merely unplumed himself that others may be decorated with his feathers.

It is to this day true that the man who has not the means to support his suit under the present vexatious procedure may be worried

out of his rights by a policy of piling up costs by the rich; and when the impecunious have no conscience besides no means, they may use the same procedure to worry the rich by running up unnecessary costs that they know they can never pay. As a rule, there need be no such unlimited opportunities for taking unfair advantage over another man. The fact will not be disputed that a large number of respectable solicitors under many circumstances giving rise to a just cause of action feel that it is a conscientious duty to advise their clients not to go to law, but rather to submit to an unfair loss. When a patient goes to a doctor, he might just as well be met with the advice that he had better die than undergo the necessary treatment, as the fees are too heavy. What can be said for the system of a civilised country where the costs are often equal to, and at times exceed, the amount or the value of the subject of dispute; where an honest defendant is fined by means of exorbitant costs; where the established rules as to litigation do not pay honest solicitors, and yet offer every facility for abuse by the unscrupulous?

Space will not permit me to refer to all the technical and other matters that are causing the waste and leakage in costs between the writ and the trial, many men of moderate means being crippled before they can get to a hearing. I will merely direct attention very shortly to a few of the most prominent causes.

The chief object, of course, in all litigation being to ascertain as soon as possible the question to be tried, it is irritating to the lay mind to be compelled to see what was a simple matter at first, rendered obscure by formal rules, which should be within, but are beyond, the common understanding. To speak plain truths, pleadings are sometimes a kind of legal decoy duck, and most frequently serve the sole purpose of affording agreeable material for the exercise of the scientific skill and ingenuity of the lawyers. It is not only the pleadings that swell the expenses in such a fruitless manner, but the grievance is further aggravated by disputes as to particulars, and minor matters in respect to them. Moreover, they frequently raise false issues, with the result that further expenses are incurred in getting up useless evidence, and in other ways. Opponents of reform cannot raise the old cry about the dangers of new and untried measures. For in arbitration proceedings, in important bankruptcy and company winding-up matters, and in county courts, notwithstanding their extended jurisdiction, there are no pleadings. Actions are now tried in the county courts where the issues are just as important as those in the High Court—for instance, actions as to illegal distress, false imprisonment, personal injuries, employers' liability, all kinds of fraud, negligence, and the like. To any one who has had the opportunity of studying the practice in the High Court, both in the Common Law and Chancery Divisions, and

also in the county court, it is clear beyond doubt that no good reason can be advanced in support of pleadings in the large majority of High Court actions, particularly in common law, so far as the interests of the public are concerned. Defamation, perhaps, is the principal exception. No difficulty has arisen where there are none. Nor is there any waste of time. On the contrary, there is a saving, for evidence is at once directed to the true issue, clear, unobscured, and unadorned.

Many unfortunate litigants have discovered too late that the pleadings were the attractive bait that drew them on to a senseless trial. Looking at their case in the fascinating frame supplied by the lawyers, they are surprised that they should be ignorant of all the good points in their favour. Greater surprise, indeed, awaits them after the trial, when they find how deceptive was the colouring, and how expensive is the cost. Pleadings are frequently nothing but a legalised form of telling untruths. Should a man insert statements there that he would never venture to put into an ordinary document under similar circumstances in private life?

It can astonish no one except the lawyers to find some persons anxious to get their disputes settled in a business-like manner by way of arbitration proceedings that they can understand, and others to whom this course is not open preferring to settle on any terms rather than submit to the useless expenditure that the English practice encourages before they can even get to trial. It is these expenses particularly that cause ordinary business men to look askance at the law, and lead them to wonder that lawyers should be so far behind the times. The days of ignorance are gone, and the public can see through what is real and what is superfluous. There should be no interlocutory matters at all, with some rare exceptions. In the exceptional cases where they are allowed, there should be but one hearing and no adjournments, whether before Master or Judge, and no appeal.

Other fruitful sources of expense between writ and trial still arise out of 'discovery,' delaying many actions that could be heard at once, and out of questions as to time, all kinds of adjournments (often merely pleasant instances of judicial courtesy at the expense of litigants), and many other similar matters. Again, in the Chancery Division we have useless hearings before the Master when nothing is done but to adjourn to the Judge; and there is yet too much liberality by the living in paying costs out of the assets of those who are perhaps fortunate in being no longer here to witness the sacrifice of their thrifty savings. A good deal of waste as to adjournments and the like will be prevented, by the by, when the work between the Court offices in both divisions and solicitors is carried out on more business-like lines. If the Judicature Acts were intended to do anything, they ought to have rendered it impossible to obtain more

costs, merely by commencing an action in the Chancery Division instead of the Common Law. So, also, the nature of the applications made in chambers in these two divisions often varies, not so much on account of the subject matter of the action, as by reason of the different education of the counsel employed. On the Common Law side, an injunction can usually be obtained at moderate cost; the same application in Chancery generally necessitates much greater expense. Heavy costs have reduced the number of actions where motions are necessary; because many motions, such as those for injunctions as to ancient lights and the like, ought to have been made the hearing of the dispute once for all. I have known instances of prosperous men in the business classes who have been almost broken down in consequence of the costs they have been dragged into by some Chancery actions of this kind. In fact, the Chancery Division particularly, and Common Law Division generally, are beyond the pockets of the middle classes.

But I must pass from this cursory glance at matters of interlocutory practice which are eating away the vitals of the law. They cannot be of interest to the general public, who are only concerned with the actual and practical result to themselves.

After all, what advantage can be attained by further reference to many other legalised imperfections? The great defects, that permit all this wasted expenditure between the writ and the hearing are well known to those who are willing to sink selfish ends and to follow a sense of duty, and to those who ought to provide the remedy. The introduction of a summons for directions after the appearance to the writ was a half-hearted step towards stopping the flagrant leakage—a mere attempt to gloss over the evil instead of striking at the root of it. It was an ill-judged and inexpedient piece of tinkering, mainly at the expense of the solicitor, the Revenue securing about the same amount of fees. There is absolutely no uniformity in the practice. The public are obliged to trust in the dark to what may happen under such a summons, whereas they have a right to a clear and definite system exercised in the light of day.

The fact is that pleadings, and all matters and proceedings between writ and trial, should be the exception instead of the rule. A writ endorsed with clear particulars of demand, stating concisely the relief which plaintiff claims, without anything else, is quite sufficient in the great majority of Common Law cases, and in such actions as are brought in the Chancery Division, as mentioned above, merely for costs. In nearly every case the relief required, and the real defence, are well known to the parties until the lawyers make the issue less intelligible. There must be one thing or the other, either a simple and business-like system of practice, or an artificial one which must then be complete with all the mathematical and elastic details so dear to the lawyer, but so ruinous to the people. In the interest of

civilisation, let us have the former, with the practical and popular arrangement of writ and particulars and trial; except in such actions as defamation, or when there are special defences, or special leave is given at the risk of the person obtaining such an order.

Rules of Court, up to the present, seem to have been made for lawyers by lawyers with minds never free from the imaginary requirements of a fictitious system, never directed simply to the naked and undisguised features of controversies, to the practical business facts. The present rules have consequently led to an enormous network of decisions upon most insignificant points impeding, in the light of common sense, rather than facilitating the trial of the real dispute. These decisions form a colossal monument of the close reasoning of the lawyers, raised by the unnecessary contributions extorted from the unfortunate litigants. But the public want no more, and will have no more, of such monuments.

The mode of remuneration has always been the real stumbling-block in the way of solid reform. It need not be, if lawyers will condescend to deal with the matter upon a common commercial basis. Ever since they got the upper hand in this country, the length of the proceedings has unfortunately been the chief test in our system. A disadvantageous and mischievous plan! Why, indeed, the length and not the subject of dispute? The principle is impolitic and unsound at the bottom; it is the cause of the present unhealthy condition of affairs. Added to this, we get a procedure that unwisely offers to the weak and unscrupulous all kinds of excuses of a plausible nature for increasing the number of and prolonging attendances, multiplying documents and copies and stretching out the contents. Time and money are wasted on work that is useless; expedition is lost sight of, and in this manner attention is diverted from the actual question in dispute. The Revenue authorities, as a consequence, have been drawn into the mistake of settling the court fees on a similar illusory footing. The engineer, the architect, the auctioneer, the estate agent are paid according to the value of the matter they have to deal with. So also the remuneration of the lawyer should be tested by the nature of the task to be done, and not by the length to which he may be able to extend it. Given the simplified practice, there should be a carefully prepared sliding scale of costs regulated strictly by the amount in dispute, and in certain cases by the difficulty of the question at issue. This will encourage zealous assiduity and good work in the true direction. There are reasons equally cogent in favour of providing remuneration upon a similar basis when a solicitor settles an action. Under the present scale, if he exercise the great skill required to do this, he is often at a loss.

As an illustration of what I am referring to, take the most important as well as the most expensive part of the proceedings before

trial, the 'getting-up' and preparation of the evidence. It is an extraordinary fact that this is the work for which the remuneration is, as a rule, totally insufficient. These are just the kind of expenses that help to swell the amount that a successful litigant finds that he has to pay beyond anything he has recovered from his opponent. To win thus often means to lose. One of the most essential steps towards remunerating the lawyer satisfactorily for real work, preventing abuses, and at the same time relieving the client from the injustice of paying costs when he has shown that he is in the right, is to be partly accomplished in the way I am suggesting. Utilise some portion of the heavy costs, that are now frittered away with an unsparing hand between the writ and trial, in paying more satisfactorily the all-important work of 'getting up' the real evidence. Cut down in other ways the expenses now wasted upon the spurious and artificial part of the action, and increase the remuneration for the genuine and business part. It has been truly said that many cases have been fought and won in a solicitor's office. Not, however, in every solicitor's office.

If this particular work is to be adequately paid for, it is well, before leaving the subject, *par parenthèse*, to remark that the ability to 'get up' evidence is a special talent that requires more careful cultivation. The most valuable practising lawyer is the man who possesses the well-balanced power of intellect that helps him to seize upon the crucial points, to clear away all imaginary surroundings, to estimate the value of all the various sides of the particular position of affairs, to place the true weight on each detail, and, free from any bias or bent of his own mind, guides him without hesitation to apply the right law to the salient facts, and to get up the evidence accordingly. Moreover, the incessant arguing from authorities on points of practice is most prejudicial to the advocate. Intellect and energies that should be devoted to careful search for right and truth are warped and often wasted by the time necessitated in learning all the tricks and the arts of interlocutory matters in the litigation.

One word only as to appeals, to which the English system still lends itself too easily. Some further restriction is necessary, and particularly on those of a speculative nature. The public would prefer the 'expedition, simplicity, and equality of arbitrary judgments;' and would rather take the rare chance of a decision that they thought was wrong, than be open to the endless worry, uncertainty, and expense of appeals that, from a rational point of view, more often than not merely lead to fine distinctions, to subtle and sometimes eccentric differences of opinion by men of the same calibre of mind and subject to the same human influences. Who encourages, who alone makes capital out of many appeals?

I must not stop to refer to the empty distinction made between the high court and the county court, beyond saying that it leads

to some absolutely useless procedure, and to futile questions of costs that only feed the lawyers and punish the public. One court, one division with district courts, one sliding scale of costs from top to bottom without drawing an arbitrary line at any fixed amount as at present, would remove a vast multitude of defects.

It would not be possible to leave the subject of costs without referring to a most delicate question—whether counsel's fees unduly add to the expense of litigation. When complaints are made as to heavy law expenses, it is constantly said by solicitors that the larger portion has gone to pay counsel's fees. *In foro conscientiae*, it must be said that this is very often correct, and the solicitors suffer in consequence, and are being crushed out of litigation where they are anxious to cut down the abuses of the procedure. On several occasions, the question has been mooted whether the two occupations should not be merged into one. Whether some modified reform in this direction would not be advantageous to the profession and to the public, I cannot enter into now. No doubt, the men who are great advocates would remain at the top under any circumstances, and still confine their attention to advocacy alone. We should get a more real division between the advocate and the other lawyers. But in this country we have not only two occupations, two branches, solicitor and barrister, but a third in the shape of a King's counsel. Whatever doubt there may be as to merging the two occupations, there can be no doubt as to the aggravation of present difficulties caused by the third.

It is needless to say that a K.C. is now nothing more than an entirely honorary title. Out of the whole number very few are in active practice. But having regard to the supposed influence upon the Bench, litigants are often driven to bring in this third aid. It is quite clear that this further expense seriously undermines the smaller class of litigation. The stray briefs spread over the 'silks' in moderate practice are of little use to them, but the general effect upon litigants is evident. It is idle to say that their employment is optional; it is well known when a solicitor represents to his client that his opponent has retained a K.C., and he (the client) will not be on such advantageous terms if he does not, that he has only one course open to him. Many men of slender means have had to make cruel and unnecessary sacrifices under these circumstances. The scale of remuneration tends in certain cases to encourage an increase in the number of briefs to be prepared; and the employment, too, of the third mind still further conduces to the inordinate length to which some trials are dragged out.

The K.C. represents a profession that is not only dying of its dignity, but, whilst it is slowly and surely committing suicide, it is dragging the other branches of the profession to the same fate. A millstone round the neck of the smaller, and what should be the

largest class of, litigants, and a crushing dead-weight upon many others! 'Taking silk' is popular with the junior bar, because it is supposed to release a certain amount of work. This is a sad fallacy. It is, indeed, a very insignificant matter to a few individuals, when the broad effect of the present state of affairs on the public mind is considered; for the excessive cost of litigation is surely cutting away step by step the ladder on which the general body of the profession hope to ascend. The great men who stand head and shoulders above their comrades are, and will always be, a necessity for those who can afford to pay them. It is, perhaps, too much to hope that this ancient order be uprooted, but undoubtedly it will have to be placed on a new basis. Speaking generally, is it not better to have increasing small fees than decreasing fees altogether? The first practical step, at any rate, towards the real remedy is not to allow the employment of this third mind in the smaller class of actions and in disputes up to a fixed amount. It is useless to play with this question by suggesting that the taxing master has a discretionary power, because he would rarely under existing circumstances take upon himself to exercise it. The rule must prescribe that the third mind is not to be employed at all.

The present rules of practice are not framed on lines that tend to stimulate the mutual confidence, or to bring about the identity of interests, which ought to exist between the lawyers and their clients in all litigation. This is mainly due to two causes. Firstly, the mode of remuneration, as pointed out, is not regulated by the actual dispute, but is framed upon an unreal basis. Secondly, and as a consequence, a great mass of the matters that are, or would be, litigated, and which generally concern the commercial and middle classes, do not adequately remunerate the solicitors if these rules are strictly followed. This leads in some quarters to an unhealthy inclination to push forward litigation of a doubtful character; and the good work is driven from the courts. Lawyers have a great monopoly, but they are really their own enemies. With many, the general consideration of any reform is narrowed down to the question how far it will reduce costs. Yet such a body of men might be expected to be the first properly to appreciate the fact that a broad reform of a genuine kind that will enable more litigants to enter the courts, and will offer adequate remuneration for real work, must in the end improve the character and amount of litigation. It has been proved that a marked advancement in all branches of life follows a real attempt to meet the public needs. But it must be real.

It seems so difficult for lawyers to get outside their intense leaning towards mere forms, and to survey the situation from far above their close confines. During the past, they have shown themselves to be the most obstinate of men, opposing reforms, and delighting in making the law as obscure, and as difficult to be understood by

the people, as possible. Even the law reformers of the Commonwealth met with extraordinary opposition before they were able to provide that all legal records should be in the language of the country. Upon the Restoration, however, the lawyers were too strong for the people; they stubbornly had their way until George the Second.

Great improvements have been prevented by a petty formal point advanced by the lawyers—*doctissimum genus indoctissimorum hominum*. It must be confessed that the most obdurate opponents to real reform have been found amongst some of the leading members on the Chancery side. They have not the same opportunities as their Common Law brethren of cultivating a knowledge of mankind. Men who are closely hedged round within the limits of their professional habits, which have become deep-rooted in them, are, as a rule, not satisfactorily qualified to form a comprehensive view of the practical working of that multiform machine which is now required to turn out justice in a way that will meet the fair demands of the modern community.

The power to bring about innovation in the procedure of the courts is under present circumstances too much, in fact it is entirely, in the hands of the lawyers; the greater the unnecessary amount of detail that they alone may be able to grasp, the more difficult is the puzzle to others. No doubt, as Lord Macaulay says, the perfect law-giver is a just temper between the mere man of theory, who can see nothing but general principles, and the mere man of business, who can see nothing but particular circumstances. In a modern free polity, the importance of the lawyers is beyond dispute, but in order that they may retain that position there must be an earnest attempt to keep up to date with modern intelligence.

Most ordinary persons will wonder why a matter of necessity which appeals to the common sense of every member of the public has not been willingly dealt with. Consider, in a short practical form, who are really standing in the way of the people. The result is amazing, because it shows how overwhelming is the controlling power of a few, how a mere handful of persons can baulk the whole community, how one grain of sand in the legal machinery can stop the perfection of its great works.

In favour of the simplification of procedure for the people :

- (1) The whole lay population.
- (2) A large number of the main body of solicitors and especially of the younger generation who are more in accord with the spirit of the times.

(3) Many thinking members of the bar for the same reason.

Opposing it :

- (1) A few of the leading members of the bar, particularly the Chancery Bar.

(2) A few solicitors who are at the top of this branch of the profession.

The reason why the lawyers as a body are deemed to exhibit so little public spirit, compared with those who follow other vocations, is not, therefore, difficult to trace. They are in the power of antiquated institutions; and here again we want fresh life and vigour. The wish to originate reform, the feeling of independence, that were present in the earlier part of life have grown year by year weaker as the leading members have advanced in the profession, until they have even become over-sensitive at the mere suggestion of a radical purification of the system. The institution that guides the destinies of the solicitors does not sufficiently represent the wishes of the great body of that branch. The bar is worse off. It possesses a council, a modern creation, that cannot be said to be more than a mere protection society; and the Inns of Court, time-honoured but time-worn and nodding to their fall. The latter have never looked at the legal world from the broad standpoint of the public; they have shown little, if any, spirit either as regards the needs of the community or the welfare of the profession of the law beyond the walls of their own precincts.

To whom, then, can the public look for assistance? In order to ascertain this, we must very shortly refer to the existing powers of making new rules, and to the difficulties in the way of any revision by statute. It would be useless to disguise the fact that the present constitution of the Rule Committee under the Judicature Acts is in no way suited to the requirements of the present day. The members are not sufficiently in touch with the public or the professional needs of the moment. This arises, if I may be permitted to say so, from no fault of the Judges forming that Committee. They have onerous duties to perform daily, and cannot be expected either to devote the time and the energy for the work of revision, or to give the close attention that is absolutely necessary in order to properly form an estimate of the real situation. Moreover, Judges may notice particular points of practice that require alteration, but they have not the opportunity of looking at the whole machinery from the best vantage-ground. 'A mind long hackneyed in anatomising the nice distinctions of words must be the less equal to grapple with the more extended bearings of things; and he that regulates most of his conclusions by precedent, that is past, will be somewhat embarrassed when he has to do with power that is present.' The head that can analyse and digest a vast mass of evidence, or reconcile any number of contradictory precedents, is not the best class of mind, as a rule, to deal with broad and popular reforms of fundamental principles.

Something of this kind was felt when the patching-up process was again resorted to by means of the Judicature Act, 1894, which provides that the President of the Incorporated Law Society, a

practising barrister, and another (never appointed) may be included in the Committee. It is quite clear that a Committee constituted as it is at present will never be bold enough to make the sweeping innovations that are necessary. There is, and naturally so, a strong sympathetic feeling between Judges and the profession from which they come. It can be easily understood that the Judges would be reluctant to take any radical step that the leaders of the profession might oppose. Again, can a system of legal procedure framed by lawyers only who are to practise under it one way or the other be said to be politic or expedient?

What is the remedy? In the interests of every one there should be a permanent Advisory Board on law and practice under the presidency of a Minister of Justice or the Lord Chancellor, and formed of jurists and members who have not only a general knowledge of practice and procedure, but a sound business, commercial, or worldly experience. It must be no mere academic body. But, above all things, the members when appointed must be entirely free from professional influences. The question of the expense of supporting this Board raises no difficulty. If, by its means, the practice and procedure are simplified, there will be absolutely no necessity for the appointment of extra Judges or officials; there will also be a great saving in other directions, more than sufficient to cover the outlay. It is not our judicial staff that requires alteration, but our legal system must be more under control. Passing from the practical reasons for this innovation, there are higher and more weighty grounds. Such a step will make good something that has been wanting in the great organisation of our national constitution. It will give the people a right that has been withheld from them, and will enable their interests to be suitably represented in all deliberations touching the proper and most efficacious means of administering their own law. It was a great mistake on the part of the State to transfer to the lawyers alone the entire power of making rules for themselves.

All these matters necessarily lead us to consider what assistance may be expected from the Houses of Parliament. We are at the outset met with a latent difficulty. The number of lawyers in the House is out of all proportion to the rest of the members. It has often been said that lawyers are not good law-makers. Recent experience has shown that a few words inserted in Bills by the 'assistance' of lawyers have greatly neutralised the effect of provisions, or raised difficulties and litigation which were not at the time apparent to the innocent lay mind. In ancient times, lawyers were by repeated Acts of Parliament disqualified from sitting as members of the House of Commons. Prynne quaintly observed that their exclusion shortened the duration of the session, facilitated the despatch of business, and had the desirable effect of 'restoring laws

to their primitive Saxon simplicity, and making them most like God's Commandments.' If simplicity in practice and procedure will in the same way be advanced by the reduction of their numbers, great will be the benefits to the people. Can the public expect that those who are making rules for themselves and their colleagues in work will, however well intentioned, be able to free themselves from all private influences, or, in other words, can they be certain that public spirit will override all other interests in the consideration of the legal reforms now required? It is also more true now, than years ago, that 'a lawyer hardly can be both learned in his profession and accomplished in political science.'

Is it necessary to sound the alarm? Is it quite realised that a danger may be insidiously working against the interests and independence of the people? On the one hand, they are allowing themselves in recent years to be represented by an excessive proportion of the legal profession, who by their special knowledge are either wielding too much power where their own interests are concerned, or are neglecting to use sufficient where the public welfare should be paramount; thus gradually rendering the community more and more dependent on them for this kind of legislation. It must also be borne in mind that, during the last century, lawyers have multiplied beyond the increase of the population and in excess of its needs; and also that their interests in legislation and those of the capitalists are often identical. On the other hand, the educated classes during the same period have been directing all their energies at high pressure to the accumulation of wealth. They have devoted comparatively little real attention to the requirements of legislation. They have neglected the best advice that was ever given, that they should make themselves acquainted with the leading principles of their own law, and they are not even taking care to see that their children possess this great safeguard of their rights. They are thus carelessly sacrificing one of the main opportunities of upholding their independence. It is astounding that the advice repeated by Blackstone should have been so shamefully ignored. He might well in these days have said that a competent knowledge of the laws of that society in which we live was of vital importance to all educated classes, particularly bearing in mind the danger to which I have just been referring.

Is it not a disgrace to this money-grubbing country to be behind the example of ancient Rome, where the small boys were compelled to learn the twelve tables, in order that the whole community might be prudent, cautious, and useful to themselves and their country? It is very significant that Shakespeare is almost invariably correct when he refers to the law, or uses legal phraseology, leading one to think that even then there was a more general knowledge of the first of human sciences. The leading principles of our law should

not be the neglected, but the guiding division of social ethics. There is no knowledge that would be more beneficial to society in the present day. Here we have a strong illustration of the want of attention to what is practical in our system of education; the one science that 'does more to quicken and invigorate the understanding than all other kinds of learning put together' is neglected. It seems unnecessary to say that I do not refer to the deep learning that is expected from a lawyer by profession, but to the knowledge of the chief and guiding principles of our laws of contract, tort, real and personal property, and elementary criminal law. Strange to say, there is no short and concise text book suitable for the purpose. There is a great opening for a digested statement of plain, undeniable legal principles compiled by a master mind, but strictly confined to the golden rules on which our legal science is founded. There are, therefore, two momentous reasons that conclusively show how important is this knowledge to all educated people. It will tend to check the preponderating and growing influence of the lawyers in the Legislature, and to ensure the introduction of improvements of our laws and legal machinery in the interests of the general public; secondly, from a business point of view it must assist to make people happier and more prosperous.

Whilst dealing with the present subject, it is expedient to refer to the much-discussed question of codification, because the simplification of the legal procedure will make the way easier for a code of English law, and a code will help to continue the work of simplification. 'Law in its present state, like orthodoxy in religion, is a mystery where reason ends and faith begins.' The history of our laws has shown a change from uncertainty to certainty, and then back again to incertitude. There is no country where words have given such opportunities of cavilling, where so little has been done to winnow the chaff out of the legal grain heaped up for so many years. The cumulative piles upon piles of details are continually covering principles and keeping them out of sight. As a consequence, the sound discussion and elucidation of principles are hampered. Nice questions as to whether a particular set of facts is of legal effect after distinguishing former decisions, some hanging on the slightest effect of a word, cause vexatious and unnecessary litigation.

This state of affairs may be agreeable to the lawyers, but it is highly detrimental and distasteful to the community. It is carried so far at times as to make lawyers ridiculous in the eyes of persons of ordinary intelligence. It has helped to swell the volumes of our law reports with pages of useless matter, and of arguments and judgments overflowing with the learned elaboration of *minutiae* to meet the criticisms of lawyers, but fruitful seeds of other litigation, where concise, definite, and unequivocal decisions were all that were required as far as the parties and the public were concerned.

That the hopelessly confused manner of representing the law of the most civilised country in the world is a continuing reproach to our generation, these volumes alone are sufficient evidence. They are a standing disgrace to this country. Sift the endless details of no importance to any one but lawyers from principles, and few law reports will be necessary. Substitute certainty for the present complexity, and commerce will immediately feel the benefits. Doctrinal books are of little service to the public in preventing unnecessary litigation that rests on arguing from authorities so dear to the lawyer's mind; the people have a right to call upon any government for a statement of their laws in a systematic and authoritative form. Long ago it was conceded that the chaotic state of the laws was a standing confession of weakness to many a government which had constantly postponed to a more convenient season the heroic work of codification. It is not sufficiently borne in mind that this country is also under a moral obligation to its colonies in this respect. They should be able to look to it for a statement of its laws resting on the authority of the supreme power, and for a system of procedure that will enable all classes to obtain justice at reasonable cost. In many parts of the colonies the innumerable text books are not at hand, and, when they are, they are of no binding authority.

It would be a great historical and a particularly appropriate monument at this time, if the descendant of the first of the Kings Edward, 'the great law-giver,' could build up the long-looked-for code, the great Edward the Seventh Code. It is easy to understand why Napoleon entertained greater feelings of pride for his code than for his victorious battles. Much has been forgotten, but that code stands, and will continue to stand, as a monument of the great mind that conferred such an inestimable legacy upon the French nation.

The main arguments in opposition to codification are merely of a hypothetical nature. They have been urged by lawyers, who, with some Judges, in the past history of this country, have multiplied evils to be apprehended that eventually proved to be unfounded.

It is futile also to say that the people will never make themselves acquainted with law. In the present state, they cannot, and it would be useless if they did. With a code, they could put their hand on an authoritative statement at once. On the other hand, the arguments in favour of codification are essentially of a practical and popular nature. Three recent Acts of Parliament have shown what can be done. But here again the lawyers have provided a loophole for old decisions and the fluctuating opinion of Judges, as these Acts are not definite and positive codes up to a given date. No credit is due to the State, for the enactments were only the result of influential pressure by public bodies or individuals.

The real difficulty, again, is that the machinery for this purpose is totally unsuitable, apart from the growing inclination to shelve

any task that calls for a great concentration of work. One of the few advantages of an absolute government, free from all direct or indirect influences, over a popular one is the facility with which such a public demand could be met. It is hopeless to do the work piecemeal by Acts of Parliament. We must adopt, as far as possible, the means by which other codes have been brought about. I have referred to the permanent Advisory Board for legal procedure. This same Board of experienced jurists of the class mentioned, free from fads and not likely to be divided into adverse factions, should be authorised to undertake the work. Power should be given to them to prepare and present a code of the leading divisions of English law up to a given date for the sanction of the Houses of Parliament. One great objection to codification would also be overcome by providing that this same body should at certain fixed periods revise the code. Men can be found for this purpose with energies equally as great as in the time of Justinian, Trebonian, or Napoleon.

The duty of aiding His Majesty in administering justice in our civil courts at a cost within the reach of the great body of his subjects who have not the purse of Fortunatus, should no longer be a mere empty phrase but a stern reality. Will the lawyers at last realise that the time has come when the rights and needs of the community must be the only guide in any genuine endeavour to remodel the whole legal structure? Or will they be content to see the usefulness of the courts for sound litigation still further reduced, the best work gradually falling away, and the dignity of the profession vanishing? If they will throw off this feeling of *après nous le déluge*, if they grasp the broad situation, and conscientiously assist in the great work, they will regain the confidence of the community, and they will start a new and, I believe, a most prosperous era for themselves. The historian of our legal system, too, will happily be able to record how the reign of King Edward the Seventh was the great epoch when the procedure of our courts, and the law of England, were at last revolutionised in the true and real interests of the people.

ALFRED EMDEN.

CO-OPERATIVE PROFIT-SHARING CANTEENS

It is well known that to every regiment in the Service there is attached an institution called the '*canteen*.' The growth of these institutions is peculiar. Originally, it seems that licensed pedlars were attached to all barracks, to supply such smaller wants of regiments as groceries and so forth, in much the same fashion as vendors of tarts used to attach themselves to the gates of public schools. After a while these men were received into barracks, and were allowed to set up a little shop and to sell beer as well as groceries. For a time, in fact, they were allowed to plunder the British soldier, until their extortion became unbearable; and regiments were driven, in the interests of the men, to set up their own canteens and coffee-shops, retaining the profits for regimental purposes. These '*Regimental Institutes*,' as they are still called, besides catering for the private wants of the soldiers, became by degrees the recognised source of supply for all articles, other than bread and meat, required for the messing of the men. Each commanding officer made his own arrangements for the supply of the regimental institute, employing such tradesmen as he thought best; and, since the institutes thus assumed new importance, they were rightly subjected by the authorities to regulation and inspection. The supply of the canteens, however, soon passed practically into the hands of a few firms, and their management into the hands of canteen-stewards and non-commissioned officers, who, by means of the knowledge which is power, acquired without difficulty the sole direction. Officers might do their best for their men according to their lights, but they could not match their zeal against the experience of the steward, even if they wished it. By means of presents, secret discounts, and rebates paid by supplying-firms for the favouring of their contracts and for the acceptance of inferior goods, to say nothing of illicit gains made by such simple tricks as the watering of beer and such like, the place of canteen-steward became more profitable than that of commanding officer.

Moreover, the fact was recognised. When a promising non-commissioned officer was promoted to be pay-sergeant, it was once a common practice to put him into the canteen for three or four months to enable him to make the 100*l.* which he was required to furnish as security for his good behaviour; and it is needless to say that he always made it. Thus the canteen-stewards grew rich, and the supplying-firms grew richer—all at the expense of the British soldier! Heaven forbid that I should judge them. The stewards were sorely tempted; the ways of the supplying-firms are the ways of trade; and the British soldier from the beginning has been regarded as a legitimate object of plunder.

At last, about ten years ago, there rose up in a certain regiment of cavalry a certain officer, a relative of my own, who resolved that in his own regiment these things should no longer be. Though no man was more guiltless of commercial training, he began by calculating what the profits of the canteen ought to be, and dismissing every canteen-steward who showed less. After dismissing seven within a few weeks he found that rare article, an honest man—a young sergeant who with real public spirit actually sacrificed his prospects of promotion to join his officer in the good work. Then reform proceeded apace. Locked tills were instituted; and it was absolutely forbidden that any money should pass over the counter. The price of every article was placed by the purchaser in a slot leading to the locked till, and if he had not the exact sum required—if, for instance, he wished to pay threepence, and had only a shilling—then he placed his shilling in the slot, received the full change sealed up in an envelope, and put the necessary threepence into the slot with his own hand. The system of course was not original, but it was a new thing in canteens, though now established (thanks to this officer) by regulation.

The next difficulty to be tackled was to obtain the best goods at the cheapest rate. The established supplying-firms to their astonishment found themselves turned adrift, as their prices were proved to be absurdly high; and, as shall presently be told, a source of supply was established, by the efforts of another officer, which enabled the canteen to lower the price of all articles for the benefit of the British soldier.

I have before me a comparative statement of the profits made by a garrison canteen under the old system and under our cavalry-officer's system in the first six months of the years 1893 and 1894. From January to June 1893, with a garrison of 950 to 1000 men, the gross profits under the old system were 494*l.* and the net profits returned to the men 249*l.* From January to June 1894, with a garrison of from 800 to 900 men, the gross profits under the new system, *after the price of all articles to the men had been lowered 20 per cent.*, were 881*l.*, and the net profits to be returned to the

men £46l. Thus it was proved that more than half of the legitimate profits due to the British soldier from the canteen had been taken from him.

But this was only the beginning. With knowledge and experience this officer was soon able to do more and more for his men. For a time they distrusted his changes, never doubting that he was diverting the canteen-steward's profits to his own pocket; but very quickly they were undeceived. There was no disputing the fact that all articles in the canteen were better and cheaper than they had ever been; but in addition to this came a series of pleasant surprises. Articles like pipe-clay, yellow ochre, and so forth, used for cleaning accoutrements and saddlery, the price of which had formerly been stopped from the men's pay, were now supplied free of charge; cocoa in the morning, coffee for the guard, refreshments at manoeuvres were also given free of charge, while the stoppage for messing, fixed by regulation at 3d., was reduced to 1½d. A word, too, must be said as to the quality of this messing. I saw the diet-sheet and the meals themselves many times, and I say without hesitation that the food was better, more abundant, and more varied than (without reproach to my old master) I received as a boy at Harrow twenty-five years ago. Finally the balance-sheet of the regimental canteen for the year 1897, now before me, shows a total of 987l. returned in one shape or another to the pockets of the men, or as near as may be 1½d. a day to 450 men for 365 days. The result was that the men were happy, comfortable, and contented; the young recruits broadened out rapidly, under liberal diet, into well-grown men; and the moral tone of all ranks was raised by the banishment of dishonesty and peculation. These were indirect benefits; but the point for us is that, by the exertions of a single officer in checking the plunder of the men, their pay was practically raised by as much as 1½d. or 2d. a day, without the cost of one penny to the country.

Let us part now with this officer. He gained the only rewards that he sought in the devotion of his men to him, and in a grave among a little group of them on one of the battle-fields of the Transvaal. Simultaneously with him another officer, happily still living, of a very famous regiment of infantry, had likewise been seeking how to provide the best goods at the lowest price for the British soldier, and had discovered that they could be bought from the Co-operative Wholesale Society for something like 25 per cent. less than from the old contractors. To enable him to trade with this society he and some of his friends, including our cavalry officer, registered themselves under the Industrial and Provident Societies Acts as a co-operative society for the supply of canteens—an institution now known as the Canteen and Mess Co-operative Society. To all intents and purposes this is nothing else than a friendly society,

the holding of a shareholder being limited by statute to 200*l.*, and the interest thereon by the Society's rules to 5 per cent., while all surplus profits become the property, according to true co-operative and profit-sharing principles, of the consumer.

Such an institution, steadily refusing to give presents or other emoluments to canteen-stewards, or to countenance dishonesty in any shape, was not kindly received by them; nor, naturally, was its appearance welcomed by the old canteen-supplying firms, which promptly lowered their prices, as was their right, to kill it. But the zeal of the British officer for his men triumphed over all. The authorities, doubtless confounding a friendly society with an ordinary trading society, at first forbade officers on full pay to serve on the Committee, which was not encouraging; but discipline is discipline. However, this prohibition was after a time removed, though the attitude of the authorities remained suspicious; and then there was no officer who interested himself in the matter more heartily, until the war called him to South Africa, than Colonel Ward, who has lately returned with perhaps the greatest reputation made by any officer in a country which is proverbial as the grave of reputations.

Here, then, in the canteen-system of a cavalry officer and the canteen-supply system of an infantry officer, which may both be summarised under the word *co-operation*, the plundering of the British soldier bade fair to find its death. Another year or two of peace would have established them in one form or another for good; but the war came; the whole Army went abroad; retired officers and reserve non-commissioned officers, who know nothing of the reformed system and naturally favour the system that they remember, are in charge of many of the canteens, and things seem in a fair way to return to their old channels.

The fact is that the whole system of a multitude of Regimental Institutes, conducted on no uniform principle, is faulty and obsolete. What may be done with them for the benefit of the men by industrious officers I have already shown; but, apart from the fact that all officers are not equally zealous for the welfare of their men, even the best-disposed of them say, with perfect truth, that they hold the King's commission to perform duties as soldiers and not as tradesmen. The management of a Regimental Institute is entrusted to a committee of three officers and three non-commissioned officers, with a working staff of ten men. Thus three officers are employed in superintending supplies, orders, stock-taking, and, last but not least, the daily counting of the contents of the till. Many times have I helped to count these piles of loathsome greasy coppers; and my sympathy goes out to officers who morning after morning patiently check from 20*l.* to 30*l.* worth of them. Moreover, commanding officers rightly complain of the withdrawal of so many officers and men, some 2,500 in all throughout

the Army, from their true military duties. Lastly, there is always endless trouble in closing and reopening canteens when regiments shift quarters; while on the outbreak of a great war like the present the system entirely breaks down.

Now any reversion to false methods, in the face of the experience which I have related above, would be a great injustice not only to the soldier but to the whole country. Let us be taxed by all means for the proper maintenance of the Army; but I, for one, object most strongly to be taxed in order that contractors may enrich themselves with the money that I pay for the support of the British soldier.

What is needed is a permanent Central Organisation, conducted on co-operative profit-sharing principles, and managed by a committee of regimental officers, for the supply of all Regimental Institutes. In this Central Organisation every regiment, corps, and battery should be a shareholder, and to this Organisation should be entrusted the duty of providing a permanent staff for all canteens, so as to liberate all men and officers for their purely military duties, and establish uniformity and continuity of system. This permanent staff could very well be composed of soldiers who have completed their service, and of reservists. The committee of officers, on the other hand, should all be on full pay, if possible, so as to ensure their interest in the business, unless the War Office should prefer to appoint a proportion of retired officers who could devote the whole of their time to it. Even if all were on full pay, much fewer officers would be withdrawn from military duty than under the present system. The necessary capital could either be found out of canteen-funds, or could be lent by the country, if preferred by the War Office, and repaid, thus banishing all suspicion of individual profit. When it is considered that 1*d.* per day for 240,000 men means 365,000*l.* a year, and that our captain of cavalry was able to return not 1*d.* but nearly 2*d.* a day to his men, by simple care, the public need not be afraid of advancing the money. All profits would, of course, be distributed according to the proportion of business done by each Regimental Institute, which again would ensure proper supervision by commanding officers. Regular and expert inspection would, of course, be provided by the War Office.

The scheme sounds wide, but there is no need that it should be carried out in all its fulness at once; and by proceeding gradually the whole Army could be taken into the fold. After all, it would only enable the Army to do its own buying instead of employing a middleman.

J. W. FORTESCUE.

THE DISASTROUS NEW ARMY SCHEME

ADMIRABLE as are the general sentiments expressed by the Secretary of State for War in his speech on introducing the new scheme for Army organisation, and universal as is the satisfaction given by his declaration that the efficiency of officers is to be the sole test of their fitness to command in peace as well as in war, and that the comfort and convenience of the private soldier will receive consideration, and general as is the confidence in his courage and capacity, in his earnestness and thoroughness, yet it cannot be disguised that there are grave searchings of heart over the scheme as it was laid before the House of Commons.

What the country has been looking forward to is some well-thought-out plan, based upon broad imperial lines—a plan of which the dominating principle would be the protection of the Empire as a whole and not the safety of a portion of it only; for if there is one lesson above all others that the war in South Africa has taught us, it is, that we have no longer to depend upon ourselves in the hour of danger, but that our great self-governing colonies, 'for better or for worse, for richer or for poorer,' have cast in their lot with us, and that from henceforward it is not with Great Britain that a quarrel will be fought out, but with Great Britain and her stalwart sons in every portion of her world-wide dominions. It was thought that this lesson had been taken to heart, that the narrow parochial view of our position had been banished for good and all, and that in its place would be found a lofty conception of our duties and responsibilities, based upon the recognition of the fact that the Empire which yesterday was but a vision of the old, a dream of the young, is to-day a splendid reality.

Judged by this standard, the scheme we have before us must, I do not hesitate to say, be pronounced a melancholy, it may even prove to be a disastrous, failure. This is a very strong assertion, but even a cursory examination will, I think, prove its absolute correctness. Let us then put the scheme to the test.

To begin with, there are two very simple questions, the answers to which will put the whole case in brief for us. The first is, What is the primary requisite in the shape of armed forces for the defence of the Empire? Is it a Regular Army of adequate

numbers composed of matured and seasoned men, properly equipped and thoroughly efficient, which can be despatched without delay for offensive or defensive purposes to any part of the world, or is it a sedentary army, composed of Militia, Volunteers, and Yeomanry for the defence of the United Kingdom against invasion?

The second question is: To which of the two armies, the Regular Army, which exists for Imperial purposes, or the sedentary army, which exists for home defence, does the scheme which we are now considering give the greatest prominence, and upon which does it confer the most advantages?

A phrase which fell from the War Secretary in the course of his speech supplies the reply to this last question, 'We are putting our money on the Yeomanry,' he said, and he might have added with perfect truth, 'and upon the Volunteers as well.'

To the first question there can be but one answer—that our primary requirement as a world-wide Empire is a Regular Army for employment beyond the seas wherever needed, whether to protect our Colonies, to assist in the defence of India, or to undertake offensive operations under the ægis of the fleet, and that a sedentary army is only required to repulse a raid which might be made upon these islands in the temporary absence of the fleet. It may be argued, and indeed I think it might be inferred, from Mr. Brodrick's words, that it is the opinion of the Government that we must make provision against an organised invasion on a large scale—an invasion which would imply such a continual inpouring of troops, horses, and stores, as has enabled us to conquer the Transvaal and Free State.

But to accomplish an invasion in force, continuous and methodical, it is essential that the power invading should hold the command of the sea. In our own case, if we had lost the command of the sea no invasion would be necessary. The dominant sea power need only proclaim bread stuffs contraband of war, and the pressure of famine would in a few weeks compel us to come to terms. On the other hand, until we had obtained the command of the sea, and months might elapse before this result was achieved, with the exception of any force which we might have sent to India or to the Colonies before the outbreak of hostilities, the whole of our regular army would have to remain at home. It is, therefore, evident that so long as we have the command of the sea, all we need provide against is a raid made in the temporary local absence of naval protection. Such a raid might be in considerable force; but it could not receive any continuous support, as our Navy, if in command of the sea, must inevitably cut its communications. On the other hand, if we have lost the command of the sea, no army, however numerous, however well equipped, however well disciplined, can save us from defeat by famine and by the paralysis of our industries, or the Empire from dismemberment. All we require, then, is a force at home sufficient to deal

with any body of troops which might be flung into this country at a desperate hazard. For this purpose no great mass of men is necessary. A moderate number of mobile, well-trained, matured troops would amply suffice.

If, then, it is admitted that our first duty is to provide a Regular Army for Imperial purposes, and that a Home Army is only required to meet a possible raid and not an organised invasion, it must follow that our money should be put on the former and not on the latter. In other words, if it can be shown that Mr. Brodrick's scheme does nothing of any value for the Regular Army while it does a great deal for the Home forces, and that, while it increases the latter, its practical result will be, under present conditions of recruiting, to diminish the former, then I think the assertion that, from the point of view of the real interests of the Empire, the scheme is a failure may fairly be considered to have been proved.

In the first place, as regards the Regular Army, it is true that the use of cubicles, the abolition of sentry-go, and other such concessions to the comfort of the private soldier, are all steps in the right direction; but it cannot seriously be contended that they will offer sufficient inducements to attract the right kind of recruit, especially since it is now known that the pay of a Yeomanry candidate on joining is 5s. per day. Again, nothing is to be done for non-commissioned officers. This in itself is a grave oversight, as it is essential that the Army should have non-commissioned officers of long service, the very contrary being the case now. This is vital in view of the numbers of old soldiers, in the shape of reservists, who join the colours on mobilisation, and with whom inexperienced non-commissioned officers, younger than themselves, can have little influence.

As to the strength of the Regular Army. On paper we are to have an increase in numbers at home of 30,000 men, from about 125,000 (estimated) in 1899-1900 to 155,000 men, the increase being partly obtained from the battalions which are to be released from garrison duty abroad. The Reserve is to be raised from 80,000 to 90,000 men; making a total gain of 40,000. But as the Militia Reserve of 30,000 men is to be abolished, the total gain on the Regular Army at home and the Reserve will be only 10,000 men, and even this small gain will be found on examination of its composition to be no gain under present circumstances. Indeed, I go further and say that in place of there being a gain of 10,000 men there will be a probable loss of men available for foreign service. It is difficult to avoid this conclusion if we consider the present system of recruiting and the class of recruits which are accepted.

As a gain of about 13,000 men with the colours at home is to be obtained from the battalions which are to be relieved from doing garrison duty abroad, and as these thirteen battalions at present are fit for active service, the immediate increase of strength at home

will be admitted ; but as the seasoned men pass out and their places are taken by immature youths who are not fit for any military service, it is obvious that battalions which were fit to be sent to South Africa without drawing upon the Reserves will find themselves in the normal position of the home battalions ; that is, with a large percentage of their men unfit for active service. Thus, instead of 13,000 men in complete units fit for service anywhere, we shall have in foreign garrisons eight battalions of elderly men with large stomachs who have given hostages to fortune in the shape of wives and children, and who, from age, are not well fitted for service in the field, together with five native battalions whom it may be impossible to use. The strength of the colonial garrisons will thus be sensibly reduced, and this although the Government apparently contemplates the loss of the command of the sea. Obviously, then, under the scheme, the Regular Army, unless the class of recruit radically alters and immature youths are rigorously excluded from the ranks, will lose in effective strength.

There is another point which I must touch upon for one moment, as it serves to illustrate the small regard paid to the Regular Army.

It was generally thought that the experiences of South Africa, bearing out, as they have done, the opinions of such distinguished military authorities as Sir E. Hamley and Sir G. Chesney, would have led the War Office to decide upon organising an adequate and properly constituted force of mounted infantry as a branch of the Regular Army ; but, no, they prefer to ' put their money on the Yeomanry,' a force which must be imperfectly trained, and which exists for home defence alone, though falsely styled ' Imperial.'

Having dealt broadly with the proposals with regard to the Regular Army, let me deal shortly with those which affect the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the Volunteers.

The establishment strength of the Militia, which was 128,000 in 1899-1900, is to be reduced to 100,000 and a Reserve of 50,000 is to be formed ; making a net gain of 22,000 men over the previous establishment ; but, of this total, 50,000 will not be undergoing the regular annual training. The Militia is to have a messing allowance of 3d. per day and an increased bounty ; but nothing—and this is a very important point—is done for the officers. There has never been the proper number, and the complements were largely made up of boys who used the Militia as a road to the army, and who, in place of being schoolmasters, were scholars.

Excellent as its services have been in South Africa, the Militia has figured little in despatches, and the general public, which knows all the doings of the Volunteers and Yeomanry, has never realised that there have been thirty Militia battalions in South Africa, or that these were the only organised units which the large auxiliary force could provide on the outbreak of war. At the seat of war the Militia received little or no notice, and at home it would appear that the

'money is to be put on' the Volunteers and, the Yeomanry' in place of the force which has such fine traditions behind it and which must be the backbone of any effective system of home defence. As showing the value of the force in the view of a competent observer, let me quote the opinion of the Inspector-General of Recruiting. In his report of 1898 he says :

The present war in South Africa has shown the value of the Militia and the necessity of encouraging the force in every way ; and the alacrity shown by regiments to volunteer for service abroad, and the eagerness to be embodied, shows that the force, as a whole, is animated by the best spirit.

And now as to the Yeomanry and the Volunteers. Both forces have done useful service and have fully justified the confidence their friends had in their gallantry in action and devotion to duty. What they have done to-day, if their country called upon them, they would do again to-morrow. But the work they have done, good as it is, does not warrant their being put in front of the Regular Army and the Militia. And yet this is practically what the plan does.

The reason of this special treatment is not far to seek. The man in the street has a general idea that the war has been carried through principally by the aid of the Volunteers and the Yeomanry, and that what they have done in South Africa they can do elsewhere. One wonders if the War Office shares this view, and thinks that the successes which these forces may have obtained over the Boers would be repeated if they were matched against the trained legions of Germany or of France. The Boers were numerically weak, had no cohesion, and were incapable of organised strategic operations, and we must not forget that we have it on the best authority that two months of training on the lines of communication were, happily, available to fit the C.I.V. for service in the field. Such advantages may not recur.

There are one or two other points in connection with the favourable terms which are offered to the Yeomanry and the Volunteers.

In the first place, while these terms will offer a strong attraction to the classes from which we hope to recruit our Militia, they will also attract a town class, who are not the sort of men wanted. Again, no adequate physical standard is imposed for entry into these forces, and, as has been stated by an officer who has special knowledge of the Volunteers, 'about one-third of the entire force is too young¹ to engage any foreign army invading this country.' The certain result will therefore be, as regards the Volunteers at any rate, that their ranks will continue to contain a large proportion of boys and men physically unfit for the arduous work of a campaign ; at the same time it is not proposed, and it is not possible, to give either Yeomanry or Volunteers sufficient training to make them really efficient.

I will now shortly sum up the proposals with regard to the auxiliary forces and give what appears likely to be their result.

¹ *Army Reorganisation.* Blackwood.

No less than 1,605,000*l.* for pay and allowances alone is to be spent this year upon men upon whom you impose practically no test of physical fitness, and this large sum will have to be augmented. By giving high rates of pay to the Yeomanry and the Volunteers you create increased competition between them and the Militia, which is the only auxiliary force that can be properly trained, and you create a huge mass of armed men, serving under several different conditions, which you call an army, and which will be too large for the work it may have to do and yet not efficient enough to do that work satisfactorily.

This is a policy which appears to me to be a combination of extravagance and inefficiency.

With regard to the Regular Army, the policy appears to be the same, because, while its numbers and its consequent expense are increased, its effective force will be diminished.

It appears, then, that the scheme fails not only when tested by its fitness for Imperial requisites, but when it is measured by the standard of efficiency and economy, and in this last point the most serious indictment is yet to be made. It is not, I think, going too far to say that we are asked to perpetuate a useless and extravagant system which has failed to provide the country with a sufficient army for foreign service while saddling the taxpayer with heavy charges, and which has left it to voluntary effort to supplement the troops for which the country had been paying millions per annum. The scheme is certainly imposing and attractive at the first glance, but even granted that it is an ideal one in theory, and even if it were everything that is required (the best that can be devised), it is yet doomed to fail because it is built upon a fallacy—for what else but a fallacy is the belief that an army of mature men, fit for foreign service, can be obtained for the pay of 1*s.* and a messing allowance of 3*d.* per diem? If there was ever the slightest foundation for such a Utopian idea, it has been effectually destroyed by the enlistment of Yeomanry at the pay of 5*s.* per diem. Rumour, indeed, says that the result of this proceeding is that men are deserting from the Army in order to enlist in the Yeomanry, and it cannot be supposed that, when 5*s.* can be got by a man as soon as the country is in difficulties, the right class of recruit will be obtained for 1*s.* in piping times of peace. It is doubtful whether the country has yet realised what an absolute failure our present system is. Mr. Arnold-Forster has done admirable service in exposing it, and the result of his careful investigations should be sent to every town and village in the country. Mr. Brodrick's scheme stands or falls by the system which has failed, since he said in his speech, 'I do not propose to deal again as we did three years ago with the question of the soldier's pay.' The new scheme, therefore, should receive our closest attention. The test by which its success or failure must be judged

is the answer to the question, whether or not it provided us with an army fit for foreign service. Lord Lansdowne himself has supplied us with the answer. When the Army was mobilised in October 1899 and the Army Reserve and the greater part of Militia Reserve were called out, there should have been a total of about 192,000 men with the colours, which would be available for foreign service; but, as a matter of fact, there were only about 100,000, and, in accounting for the balance of 92,000, Lord Lansdowne said, 'These men—they number 92,000 men—are, of course, in no sense a field army; they include a large number of young soldiers, men who have not yet reached the age of twenty and who are therefore not fit to be sent out of the country on foreign service.' Could there be any more complete confession of the failure to secure recruits of proper age and physique than is conveyed in Lord Lansdowne's words?—and yet no attempt is made to face the difficulty.

The use of a cubicle and the abolition of sentry-go cannot seriously be expected to appeal to the imagination of a recruit; but a substantial increase in pay on his being certified fit for foreign service would be something solid which he would appreciate. It may be said that increase of pay would mean such a heavy charge that the finances of the country would not stand the strain. If that is the case, and the country cannot afford to pay such an annual sum as will provide a real army in place of a dummy army, then I say it would be better and cheaper for the country to wipe off this huge mob of ineffectives and to rely upon a smaller army of seasoned and highly trained men. It would be better, because the country would know what force it had to its credit, not in worthless paper, but in current coin, and it would be cheaper because the amount now expended upon a dummy army—money which is as much wasted as if thrown into the sea—would be available for increased pay to the smaller field army and to the Reserves. A soldier, at a low computation, costs the State 60*l.* per annum. 92,000 men at 60*l.* per man amounts to 5,520,000*l.*, which would represent the sum expended by the country upon this dummy army if they were all men of one year's service; if one half were men of two years' service, the expenditure would amount to 8,280,000*l.* per annum. But this is not all the loss. As men of poor physique and mere youths are enlisted, there is an immense wastage, which goes on steadily from year to year. It has been calculated that in ten years 150,000 men disappear without ever completing their engagement. They have been fed, clothed, housed, doctored, etc., and have received their pay, but no return is got for this expenditure. If each of these 150,000 men has served one year at a cost of 60*l.*, it will be seen that the country loses on them at the end of ten years some 9,000,000*l.*, or, in other words, some 900,000*l.* per annum. And there is another point in connection with this question of the loss caused to the country by

the system of taking immature and feeble youths, which is that they help to materially swell the ineffective vote, and the country is saddled with a yearly charge for men who ought never to have been accepted as recruits. Could there, then, be anything more ill-advised than to shut our ears against all the teachings of experience and to persist in a method which, while it fails to provide us with a real army, wastes millions of money every year and places rapidly growing burdens upon the shoulders of that patient Issachar, the taxpayer?

Passing from the composition of the Army to its proposed organisation as Army Corps, it would be out of place for 'a man in the street' to offer any criticism upon a question which is one for experts; but what I would point out is that, whether Army Corps are adopted or divisions as the highest unit, it is, above all things, necessary that a sufficient force should be held mobilised and ready for instant embarkation. If the unit is an Army Corps, then an Army Corps should be kept ready; if a division, then three divisions. This would mean, roughly, that 30,000 men would always be kept in readiness to be moved at a moment's notice wherever they might be required. If any one doubts the soundness of this contention, let him study the speeches of Lord Wolseley and Lord Lansdowne on the 15th of March in the House of Lords. Lord Wolseley stated that he advised in September that an Army Corps should be mobilised and sent out; to this suggestion Lord Lansdowne stated that his reply was that he could not follow this advice, as their policy was 'to avoid provocation and to try to bring about peace.' Had the 30,000 men been kept in readiness, there would have been no question of mobilisation and provocation, and they could have been sent to South Africa before the outbreak of war. As it was, at a most critical time, when reinforcements were most urgently needed, we could only scrape together some 10,000 men with the greatest difficulty, 5,000 being taken from India and some 3,000 from the Colonial garrisons, which in the future are to consist largely of soldiers who have passed their prime and so will be of little use for active service in an emergency, while from home all that we could send were one very weak battalion of infantry, another which happened to be at home *en route* for the West Indies, and a brigade division of artillery made up by destroying the efficiency of many batteries. If any one wishes to obtain a vivid and convincing picture of the straits in which the War Office was placed at this time, he should consult the letters of Mr. Arnold-Forster.

Here again it would appear that the War Office shuts its eyes and stops its ears against the object-lessons and teachings of experience, because, so far as I can ascertain, there is no intention to keep an Army Corps on a war footing, and if complications again arise and if we are again involved in difficulties, the tale of the autumn of 1899 will be repeated, and the fire which the instant despatch of 30,000 men might quench would have ample time to gather force

and spread, while the Government of the day was doubting whether so strong a step as mobilisation could be justified.

Lastly, let me come to the question on which Mr. Brodrick touched in his speech, and to which great prominence was given by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman and Sir William Harcourt in their replies. I mean the question of compulsory service. 'My adhesion,' the War Secretary said, 'to the voluntary system is strictly limited by our ability to obtain under it a force with which our military authorities can satisfy the Government that they have sufficient force to resist invasion and can maintain it to their satisfaction.' One thing is clear from this statement, that the idea of raising an army by conscription for foreign service has not been in the mind of the Government. It is as well to make this quite evident, because it may be from ignorance, it may be from design, the obligation under which every citizen of the United Kingdom who is physically fit is already placed to take his part in defending his country from invasion should the necessity arise, has been presented to the public as if it were the form of compulsory service prevailing on the Continent, which is known as conscription, under which the manhood of a country is forcibly withdrawn from civil life for two or more years. It is for home service, and for no other purpose, that the Government can command our services by compulsion, and from the War Secretary's words it is plain beyond the shadow of a doubt that it was this hereditary obligation for home defence he had in his mind, and not conscription as it is known abroad. In passing it may be remarked that these words of the War Secretary entirely dispose of the deep-laid Machiavellian scheme ascribed to him—viz. that he contemplated and, indeed, invited the failure of his plan for Army Reorganisation, as this would give him the necessary excuse for introducing conscription. As there is no obligation on us to serve abroad, it is obvious that under the existing law no army for foreign service could be raised by conscription, and therefore the failure of the Army plan cannot be made good by compulsory service. Moreover, in countries which have adopted conscription, it is not attempted to employ the involuntary soldier outside his own territories in peace time.

But in considering this problem of compulsory service for home defence, the question presents itself whether it would not be a cheaper and a more effective method of raising the men required for the Home Army, than by spending more money upon Yeomanry and Volunteers; 350,000 grown men drawn by the ballot, drilled and organised on the Swiss method, which only requires a total life service from each man of some six months, and involves a cost of about 1,000,000*l.*, would give us a sufficient and a well-trained home field army. This might be supplemented by a volunteer mounted infantry force, the members of which would be exempt from the

Militia Ballot on the condition that they passed a strict physical test, reached a high standard of military efficiency, and received nothing except arms and equipment from the State, thus returning to the principles on which the Volunteers were originally formed. A high class of volunteer soldier would thus be obtained at no expense to the State, and the objection which might be raised against exemption from the ballot would be met. If, however, strong objection was taken to the creation of what might appear to be a privileged class, then the number of men to be drawn by the ballot would have to be increased. The present law provides for various exemptions and allows the man drawn to pay for a substitute. As an advocate of one law for high and low, rich and poor, I should myself pronounce against all substitutes, except perhaps in the case of theological students. It is the universality of the obligation which alone renders recruiting by ballot possible in a modern free State. These points, however, are all of detail, and do not affect the question as to whether or not we should be well advised to base the whole organisation for home defence upon the mild form of compulsory service determined by the Militia Ballot. That we should get a far better Home Army and at a cheaper rate there can be no doubt, and that the month's holiday with work in the open air and good food would have an excellent effect upon the physique of those who composed it, no one can dispute. Indeed, on this latter point it cannot be denied that the whole of the young men of the country would greatly benefit by such a course of healthy training, and it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that if a Home Army was constituted by the ballot there might, after time had been given to see the way in which it did its annual training, be keen competition to get admitted to the ranks. Anyway, this is a question that should be discussed, and must be discussed. It is a question above all others for the decision of the people themselves, and I think that our men of light and leading would do a service to the country if they reminded it that, from the days of King Alfred, who divided the freemen of the country into a field and a garrison force, down to our own day, the defence of these islands from invasion is a sacred duty laid upon every citizen, which he is bound, when the occasion arrives, to discharge. If this is done, and the country is asked to give its decision as to what the Home Army shall be, I have little doubt that the spirit which has animated our fathers through the stirring pages of our history, the spirit which sent our Volunteers and Yeomanry of all classes and degrees to fight for their Queen in South Africa, will dictate the reply, 'If this is our duty, we will have no paid men to do it for us; we will do it ourselves.' I believe that this also would be the feeling among the great colonies who came to our assistance at a national emergency, and who find no place in a scheme which has not a single Imperial feature.

R. YERBURGH.

LAST MONTH

EASTER brought this year the usual lull in the course of political events. By common consent it was the most placid Easter that we have had for several years, but the momentary calm which seemed to descend on everything was rather that which the boat experiences when it falls into the trough of the sea while the tempest still rages than that which speaks of settled weather. So far as this country is concerned, the feature of last month was undoubtedly the Budget. We all knew long ago that this must be the case. It was impossible for the least observant to shut his eyes to the fact that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer stood up in Committee of Supply on the 18th of April he would have to unfold a tale of woe. But though we all knew it, we never truly realised it until Sir Michael Hicks-Beach had made his speech. A month ago I commented upon the strange apathy of the country in presence of the colossal estimates for the Army and Navy. The apathy has disappeared now that payment of the bill is called for, and, though no grave political crisis is imminent, the whole world of politics is in a turmoil over the most disastrous Budget which any English finance minister has had to expound during the lifetime of the present generation. It was indeed a pretty story that the unfortunate Sir Michael had to tell. The figures which he laid before Parliament were, as a matter of fact, known to most of us before; but when recounted officially from the Treasury Bench they fell upon most persons with the effect of a stunning surprise. The simple statistics as to the cost of the war were in themselves startling, if indeed they might not be described as appalling. In round figures, we have spent already £50,000,000 sterling in the South African war. That is fifty per cent. more than the Crimean war cost us, and, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer took care to remind the House, it exceeds the cost of the great campaign in which Wellington broke the power of Napoleon in the Peninsula. There are thoughts which lie too deep for words, and there are figures which rise to such an altitude that the human imagination can scarcely grasp them. The question of mere money can never be allowed to count when the honour or independence of the nation is at stake; but when one looks back to September 1899, and recalls the frame of mind of the public

in those days of troubled and abortive negotiations, it is impossible not to ask oneself what would have been said then if the people of this country could have foreseen the Budget of 1901 and the circumstances amid which it has been brought forward. The most confirmed optimist will at least be constrained to admit that in the last eighteen months Great Britain has received such a lesson as to the actual meaning of warfare nowadays as was never administered to her before. We have not, of course, had the terrible awakening which France experienced thirty years ago, but we are face to face with realities so grave and so full of significance that if they do not make a profound impression upon the national mind it is impossible to conceive in what circumstances such an impression could be produced.

Everybody admits that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach did his work well, with a courage and frankness that can hardly be praised too highly. The family solicitor dealing with a profligate who was imperilling ancestral possessions, and involving himself in paralysing complications, never showed a shrewder determination not to mince matters, but to bring home to his client the risks he was running, than did Sir Michael in his memorable speech. Did he succeed in driving the truth home to the heart of the nation? That he startled the country cannot be doubted. On the day following the Budget night, one met everywhere with scared faces; but it is not yet certain that the true moral of the Budget speech has been realised by the country. There was enough, and almost more than enough, of indignant clamour from the representatives of those interests which are called upon under the Budget scheme to bear the heaviest portion of the new imposts. On the part of the extreme opponents of the war, there was almost a cry of exultation over the terrible figures that showed what the war has cost us in hard cash, as though the justice of a great international struggle were to be decided by the consideration of mere pounds and shillings. But it has yet to be shown that the nation has grasped the innermost truth that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach strove to inculcate, the kernel of the hard nut we have now to crack. That truth is the simple and unpleasant fact that, apart from the extraordinary expenditure on the war, the national expenditure is rising by leaps and bounds which are causing it rapidly to outstrip the progress of the revenue. The most notable sentence in the Chancellor's speech was that in which he reminded the House that it does not lie with either party to cast stones at the other over this matter, and that the country shares the responsibility with both parties in the representative chamber. The statement is to a large extent true. For some years past not only has there been a growing disposition on all sides to make inroads upon the public purse, but no party and no individual has attempted to prevent or limit those inroads. We have

no Joseph Hume, and it need scarcely be said that we have no Mr. Gladstone. While the great bulk of the nation insists upon adequate provision for the Navy, and upon measures of Army reform which cannot fail to be costly, the younger race of politicians, especially upon the Liberal benches, demand the application of the public funds in increased amounts to education, and to other means of improving the social position of the people. Hitherto the country has been well able to afford this increased expenditure; but now we have to face not only the cost of a great war, but the unpleasant fact that we seem to have reached the limits of our taxable revenue. This is the unpalatable truth that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach had to lay before Parliament. Unfortunately, it is a truth which does not seem to have made anything like the impression upon the public mind that has been produced by the special measures of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for raising revenue during the current year. It is true that the public generally seem to acquiesce in Sir Michael's proposals. It is only the *Standard* which continues to protest lustily against the addition to the income-tax, and even the consumers of sugar leave to dealers in that article the task of objecting to the tax that has now been imposed upon it. But the great coal interest has taken up the cudgels in its own defence against the proposal of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and has made its influence felt so strongly that some modification of the Budget is almost certain. By a curious fatality, the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his advisers seem to have forgotten when they determined to put an export duty upon coal the case of running contracts. It is strange that they were not aware of the fact that these contracts are more common and extensive in the coal trade than in almost any other branch of our national commerce, and that the imposition of a duty without allowance being made for existing contracts would be positively ruinous to great numbers of business men. The case on behalf of these persons is so strong that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was compelled to promise that he would give full consideration to it a few hours after he had introduced his Budget. In the meantime the opposition of the coal trade, and in a lesser degree of the shipping trade, to this feature of the Budget is widespread and pronounced.

In spite of this fact, it does not seem likely that the Salisbury Administration will be wrecked by its Budget proposals after the fashion in which the Gladstone Administration was wrecked in 1885. In the first place, fair-minded persons recognise the fact that the money must be found somehow or other for the current wants of the country. The bill must be paid, and we have no right to quarrel with the official whose business it is to present it to us. Yet this consideration would probably not suffice of itself to save Ministers from disaster. They are much more likely to be saved by the

conviction that, for the moment at all events, they are indispensable. Their popularity has waned in an astonishing manner since the general election of last autumn. It is in the ranks of their own supporters that the voice of condemnation is raised most loudly. No Liberals, for example, feel aggrieved by the extraordinary predominance which the Cecil family have secured in the reconstituted Cabinet. The dissatisfaction of Liberals with the Government is based upon wider and less personal grounds. But it may be said, speaking generally, that the Government has ceased to be popular, and has lost much of the confidence which was formerly reposed in it. It is not, therefore, from any blind devotion to Lord Salisbury and his colleagues that the House of Commons will refrain from taking extreme measures against them. One curious feature of the situation is the notorious fact that Ministers themselves have grown weary of their task, and that, with one or two exceptions, they would be thankful if they could find release from the burdensome chains of office. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, in his Budget speech, hardly attempted to conceal this mood from his audience, and no one who understands the existing situation will wonder at his longing for release. But who is to replace the present rulers of the country if they are to be driven from office? That is the real political problem of the hour. Current gossip affirms that some months ago Sir Michael, in conversation with a leading Liberal statesman, deplored to him the dissensions on the Opposition benches, and added significantly, 'But I will tax you into unity.' The story may or may not be true, but it is at least worth telling. Whether the fiscal proposals of the Government will lead to the establishment of real union in the ranks of the Opposition cannot as yet be said; but until such a measure of union has been attained as would enable a Ministry to be constructed from the ranks of the Liberal party, the present holders of office are secure in their seats.

Nevertheless, though knowledge of this fact is general, the less responsible members of the Opposition were keenly excited by the diminished majorities of the Government in the discussions on the Budget and by the unconcealed weariness and impatience of the House of Commons. They believed that the doom of Ministers was at hand, and the one question that seemed to interest the *quidnuncs* of the smoking-room was as to the person to whom His Majesty would entrust the formation of a new Administration. They did not seem to realise the fact that no harder fate could befall any one at the present moment than that of being compelled to shoulder the Titanic burden under which the existing Government, in spite of its immense majority in both Houses of Parliament, is visibly stumbling and sinking. That any statesman, however eager he might be to secure the reins of power, should be anxious to enter into this heritage of woe is simply inconceivable. For the

present, therefore, it seems as though we may dismiss from our minds the idea of an immediate ministerial catastrophe. Despite the portents of the hour and such precedents as that of 1885, in spite also of the obvious indifference of some members of the Cabinet as to their fate, it looks as though the Government will be left to work out the solution of the financial crisis in its own way. We have been brought within what Mr. Gladstone used to call 'measurable distance' of a crisis; but that is all.

The significant feature of the Budget, however, cannot be allowed to pass out of sight. We are a rich country, a great country; but of late there have been many signs of the approach of a day when we shall have to put forth all our strength if we are to maintain even our present state of wealth and prosperity. That our commerce and our industries are threatened by the huge commercial and industrial combinations of the United States, and the keen and intelligent rivalry of Germany, can hardly be denied. British resourcefulness and determination may enable us to face the new competition successfully; but we can hardly hope that in the future there will be that wide margin of material superiority in our favour which has enabled us in the past to treat with indifference our failure to hold our own in some particular branch of industry or commerce. We are being attacked on every side, and on no single point can we now afford to be beaten. But it is at this moment, when our trade, though still prosperous, has entered upon a critical phase of its history, that we find ourselves for the first time in half a century wincing under the burden of taxation imposed upon us. And all the time our expenditure, our normal expenditure, is rising steadily. How are we to meet the increased and ever-increasing obligations that are thus laid upon us? In what quarter are we to look for that increased revenue which imperatively must be secured if the normal estimates of all kinds are to continue to grow as they have grown of late? These are the questions which demand the serious and immediate attention of all interested in the future of the commonwealth. Not since the days of Lord Randolph Churchill's brief sojourn at the Treasury has any English statesman really attempted to grapple with the economic question upon which our future depends so largely. Is there any one to take up the part which Lord Randolph sought to play, and which he, in his turn, had inherited from Mr. Gladstone? The need for some movement which shall 'put the Empire on a business footing' was never more clearly apparent than it is to-day, on the morrow of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's disastrous Budget. A yearly expenditure of more than 127,000,000*l.* and an income-tax of fourteen pence in the pound are arguments that even the most stubborn and besotted of political optimists will find irresistible, and that no amount of platform eloquence can affect.

There remains as the other grave feature of the Budget the cost

of the war. Members seemed to shrink visibly when the Chancellor of the Exchequer told his dismal tale on this subject, and nowhere was the emotion thus betrayed more evident than among the occupants of the Treasury Bench. We knew that the operations in South Africa were costly; we might even have calculated them for ourselves if we had chosen to take the trouble, for Ministers have been frank enough upon this subject, at all events of late. But when the House was told that up to the end of last month the South African war had cost more than 88,000,000*l.*, and that for the current year the provision needed was an additional 58,000,000*l.*, a thrill of horrified incredulity seemed to pass over it. On a subsequent day it was stated by Mr. Brodrick that the present cost of our operations in South Africa is a million and a half a week! Certainly nobody will be able hereafter to sneer at the South African campaign as a little war. It has already cost more than some of the most difficult campaigns in our history, and he must be a sanguine man who imagines that its ultimate cost will fall short of 150,000,000*l.*—just fifteen times the amount at which the first estimate of its cost was placed. It is useless to discuss these figures. Their magnitude places them beyond the reach of the ordinary imagination. They cannot be substantially touched by new taxation. Even such purists as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Sir William Harcourt are compelled to admit this. Certain of the extreme opponents of the war are credited with the desire to compel the present generation to pay every penny of its cost; but even they know this is an operation which cannot be carried out in one year or in two. We have had to bear heavy additional burdens, as has already been seen, but the war expenditure must in the main be borne by posterity. A hundred millions, at least, is to be added to the National Debt, and the sound finance which has been our pride for forty years past must for the present be abandoned. This is part—alas! only part—of the price we have to pay for the conquest of the Transvaal.

There is naturally much speculation as to the effect which the full knowledge of the costliness of the war is likely to have upon the war feeling in this country. Nothing, of course, can be more illogical than to allow our opinion of the merits of the war to be affected by this question of expenditure. No serious person will change his mind as to Mr. Kruger's honesty or Mr. Chamberlain's diplomatic methods simply because he finds that the cost of substituting British for Boer supremacy in the Transvaal is infinitely greater than was anticipated. But serious persons do not form a majority of the community nowadays, and the feather-headed multitude which was so full of warlike ardour twelve months ago may rush to the opposite extreme now, when the band has ceased to play and the bill has been laid before us. It may be so. This, I know, is the hope and belief of many of the opponents of the South

African policy of the Government. They look for a great revulsion of feeling which shall make it possible to settle the question of the Transvaal before the question of supremacy in South Africa has been fought to an end. There are, however, as yet no signs that the calculations of these gentlemen are correct. The country shudders at the figures that have just been laid before it, grumbles at the new taxation, is impatient at the slow progress of the struggle; but shows no sign of giving in. The inherent stubbornness of our race is made apparent now, when we have to face the inevitable and unpleasant cost of even the most successful military operations, just as it was made apparent when things were at their worst in Natal and Cape Colony, and the friends of the Boers implored us to yield because we could never relieve Ladysmith or capture the entrenchments in which General Cronje awaited our advance. After all, the national 'grit' which enabled us to rise superior to the depression caused by the great reverses of the winter of 1899 may also enable us to resist the sordid pressure of the colossal figures of the Budget. Yet it may be permitted to all of us to hope that the lesson we have now been taught, though it cannot affect our judgment upon the merits of the quarrel between Dutch and English in South Africa, will put an end to that spirit of aggressive militarism which was rampant among large classes in this country even before this war broke out. We know now better than we did three years ago what the meaning and the cost of war really are, and for the future we may hope that we shall hear less in its praise from the oracles of the music hall, not to speak of the oracles of more refined and pretentious circles.

For the serious man the gravest event of the month, so far as the war is concerned, has been not the revelation of the Budget, but the publication of the remarkable despatch in which Sir Alfred Milner has discussed the situation and the prospects in South Africa. The military operations reported from day to day during the month have shown that serious resistance to our arms is everywhere at an end; but we have also learned that the irregular warfare carried on by the scattered remnants of the Boer army is being as actively pursued as ever, and that we have still to pacify the territory we have conquered. Sporadic outbreaks of rebellion in Cape Colony itself have continued during the month, and while there is no reason to doubt that the overwhelming majority of the enemy still left in the field are suffering from weariness and exhaustion, we cannot pretend to have ascertained at what point the struggle will cease and peace be re-established. In these circumstances special importance is to be attached to the despatch in which Sir Alfred Milner stated his views to the Home Government on the 6th of February. It cannot be said that Sir Alfred's opinion is calculated to strengthen our hopes of an early peace. Comparing the situation in South Africa in

February with that which existed six months earlier, he finds himself compelled to admit that his hopes have not been realised, and that during the intervening period the course of events had been distinctly retrogressive. With the breakdown of the organised military operations of the enemy and the flight of the Government a new stage in the struggle had begun which was even more difficult and complicated than that which had preceded it. The invasion of Cape Colony and the devastating operations of the irregular Boer forces had inflicted enormous material losses upon the inhabitants of the country, while the conditions under which the struggle was now being carried on were such that it was impossible to hope that peace could be restored by any single success, however brilliant, on the part of our army. In these circumstances Sir Alfred Milner found himself compelled to acknowledge that he could not fix any point at which it would be possible to say that the war was actually at an end. He could not foresee the moment at which we should pass the dividing line between a state of war and one of peace. 'I have not the slightest doubt of the ultimate result,' he wrote, 'but I foresee that the work will be slower, more difficult, more harassing, and more expensive than was at one time anticipated.' All this is somewhat depressing, and it has encouraged some of the opponents of the war to press for an immediate peace which will involve the restoration of Boer independence. But, on the other hand, Sir Alfred Milner is able to assure us that in South Africa—where, after all, the sacrifices of the war have been heaviest—there is no disposition to buy peace at such a price as this. Summing up the feeling of the supporters of the Imperial Government in South Africa, he says: 'They are sick to death of the war, which has brought ruin to many of them, and imposed considerable sacrifices on almost all. But they would rather see the war continue for an indefinite time than run the risk of any compromise which would leave even the remotest chance of the recurrence of so terrible a scourge in the future.' There is thus a similar feeling in South Africa to that which seems to prevail in this country with regard to the war. Terrible as its cost has been, and tedious and painful as is its prolongation under the new conditions, the determination to carry the struggle through to the end is as firmly held as ever.

Parliament has been called upon during the month to deal with a question which happily does not give rise to party recriminations, but which does suggest the existence of certain curious constitutional anomalies. Just before the adjournment of the House of Commons for the Easter recess the chief legal adviser of the Government brought in a measure called the Demise of the Crown Bill. Its purpose is to prevent that wholesale vacating of offices which now takes place upon the death of an English Sovereign. When it is passed, officials of all classes who hold appointments under the Crown

will no longer be automatically deprived of their posts by the demise of the Crown. We have had since January last ample experience of the inconvenience caused by the existing system, a system which is in itself a relic of the days when the Sovereign was the all-important person in English life, and it was by his will and his only that any one could hold an office of trust or authority. In the case of a 'thoroughly constitutional sovereignty,' such as that of Great Britain has now become, this system is obsolete and vexatious; it does not protect any legitimate prerogative of the Crown, and it answers no other useful purpose. The Demise of the Crown Bill is therefore a measure which every constitutional reformer must welcome. But the Bill is made retrospective in its action, and thereby hangs a tale which has caused much excitement among the Tapers and Tadpoles of the Lobby. It has been found that grave doubts exist as to whether certain Ministers of the Crown did not vacate their seats in the House of Commons when they were re-appointed to their old posts by the King immediately upon his accession. The First Lord of the Treasury is one of the Ministers with regard to whose position this doubt prevails, and as a natural consequence there has been lively speculation on the subject in the outer courts of the House of Commons. I believe that the point of law involved is one of such extreme difficulty and delicacy that even the most learned of our constitutional jurists are not agreed among themselves concerning it. In these circumstances it would be the height of presumption for a layman to express an opinion of his own. The truth seems to be that during the sixty-three years' reign of the late Queen those officials who have the most important parts to play when a demise of the Crown takes place had become so rusty in their knowledge of precedent that many essential formalities were forgotten at the moment when the sceptre passed from the Queen's hands into those of her son. The Demise of the Crown Bill is meant to set right anything that may accidentally have gone wrong in that time of national excitement and grief. It is not a measure to which any legitimate opposition can possibly be raised, though its introduction in the House of Commons has revealed a condition of things which has enabled Mr. Labouchere to exercise his taste for comedy by 'spying a stranger' in the person of Mr. Balfour upon the Treasury Bench.

The Parliamentary Committee to which the task of considering the King's Civil List was entrusted completed its work before Easter. As was generally anticipated, the provision which the Committee recommends should be made for the maintenance of the Crown during the new reign is somewhat larger than that which Parliament granted to Queen Victoria more than sixty years ago. But it does not err upon the side of extravagance, and there is no reason to suppose that any change in the proposals of the Committee will be made when the

question is submitted to the House. Mr. Labouchere, it is true, prepared a report of his own in place of that adopted by the majority of the Committee; but he secured no support for his proposals, and as a matter of fact the difference between the sum which he suggested should be provided for the use of the Sovereign and that to which the other members of the Committee agreed was almost nominal. The changes that the Committee recommend in the incidence and application of the new Civil List are all in the nature of improvements suggested by actual experience during the last reign. The King has spent most of his time during the past month at Windsor and Sandringham. No change has as yet taken place in the arrangements connected with the royal residences, but it is understood that the extensive alterations which are required both at Buckingham Palace and at Windsor to fit them for the requirements of the new Court are to be undertaken at once. The journey of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to the outlying portions of the Empire has proceeded so far with complete success. At Malta, and in the island of Ceylon in particular, the reception given to the Heir Apparent and his wife has surpassed anything recorded in connection with any previous royal progress. For the next two months popular interest in connection with the travels of the illustrious couple will be centred upon our Australian colonies. One notable feature of the past month deserves mention ere I turn from the subject of the Royal Family. The public mourning for Queen Victoria came to an end on the 17th of April. It had then lasted for twelve weeks, an unusually long period. But to the surprise of most observers the 17th of April brought no perceptible change in the aspect of the streets of London. There was no sudden rush from the depth of woe to the brilliant colours of an ordinary spring-tide. On the contrary, it seemed as though everywhere people were almost reluctant to put off the mourning garb they had worn so long. And we have since been told by those who speak with authority on such subjects that in the coming summer the world of fashion will array itself in sober hues. It is impossible not to recognise in this plain proof of the fact that the mourning for the beloved Queen Victoria has been in no sense formal. The profound emotion which stirred the nation's heart last January was not a mere passing sentiment. The country still looks back with a deep sense of grief and bereavement to the loss which it then sustained, and all classes seem to be almost unwilling to part with the outward signs of their genuine sorrow. The fact seems worth recording when one remembers in what temper the deaths of kings and queens have been too often regarded by their subjects.

The list of honours conferred in connection with the war was published towards the close of the month. It was a long list—too long, it will seem to those who hold the old-fashioned theory that no special reward is due to a man for the faithful performance of his

duty. But, though very long, the list has not satisfied everybody. The newspapers have pointed out more than one serious omission from it, and have drawn attention to the scanty acknowledgment which has been made of the services of some who had to bear the brunt of the hard struggle in South Africa before Lord Roberts had arrived upon the scene. No doubt there is always dissatisfaction over the preparation of such lists, however carefully and conscientiously they may have been compiled. But this list suffers from being at once too long and too vague. Reading it one is almost forced to the conclusion that no really great achievements have marked the progress of the war, and above all that the Army of Natal—which suffered so much, and in the end accomplished its task so completely—has for some reason unknown failed to find favour with the authorities responsible for the distribution of honours.

Two questions connected with the affairs of the outer world have attracted special attention during the month. The first has been the slow advance that has been made towards a settlement of the difficulties in China, and the second the visit of the Italian fleet to Toulon. At Peking the diplomatists are still engaged in the profitless task of marking time. But little progress has been made during the month in the settlement of the general questions arising from the massacre of the Christians and the siege of the Legations. The indemnities demanded by the different Powers have startled the world by the contrasts which they offer. Apparently some of the Governments have thought only of extracting the largest amount they could from the Chinese authorities; while others have rigidly confined themselves to a demand for reparation for the losses they have actually incurred. But the most startling event of the month has been the defeat of Russia in its attempt to compel China to enter into a separate agreement with it on the subject of Manchuria. It seemed for a time that, in spite of the protests of Great Britain, and of all the other Powers with the exception of France and the United States, Russia would be successful in thus reducing China to a state of vassalage to herself so far as Manchuria was concerned. But in the end the bold scheme has been defeated, and for the moment the purposes of Russia have been foiled. No one pretends to know exactly how this has been brought about; but unquestionably to Japan belongs a large share in the credit for this victory of the rest of the civilised world over Russia. What is most remarkable in connection with this story is the fact that something like a healthy public opinion has been created in China itself, and that this public opinion has proved too strong to be resisted, not merely by Russia, but by her overbearing agent Li Hung Chang. It almost begins to appear as though a real and tangible China may yet be evolved from the chaos of to-day.

As for the meeting between the French and Italian fleets at

Toulon, there seems no reason why it should create uneasiness among the other European Powers. But it emphasises the fact, too long ignored by the statesmen of Europe, that there are real bonds of sympathy and good will between the peoples of Italy and France, and that these bonds are not to be severed by the devices of politicians. No one who was in the south of France when the Toulon festivities occurred can entertain any doubts as to the genuineness of the enthusiasm which was displayed in Nice and Toulon in connection with the visit of the Italian squadron. The Triple Alliance, we are assured, has not been imperilled by this remarkable demonstration; nor will it affect the excellent understanding that happily prevails between the Governments of Great Britain and Italy. This may be perfectly true, and yet it is impossible to ignore the fact that the world has just received an emphatic warning that it must not count upon Franco-Italian jealousy as one of the factors in the political future of Europe. Whatever may be the truth regarding the rumoured understanding between Great Britain and Italy on the subject of the balance of power in the Mediterranean, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that a new order of things is coming into existence in that part of the world, and that the position of England is no longer so unassailable as it seemed to be a few years ago in the great inland sea. With Russia in the Mediterranean, and with Italy drawing closer to France, it behoves this country to take stock of its position and to see that it is at least strong enough in its naval force at Malta to be able to protect its own interests from whatever quarter they may be threatened. That any threat to the peace of the world is involved in the Toulon demonstrations is not for a moment to be imagined, nor is there any reason to doubt the good faith and good will of the Italian Government. But that changes are taking place in the distribution of political forces in the south of Europe which the statesmen of Great Britain cannot afford to ignore is hardly to be questioned.

WEMYSS REID.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER



No. CCXCII—JUNE 1901

BRITISH PESSIMISM

FOR thirty odd years the writer has been visiting his native land, but never to find such despondency among his friends of the industrial world as this year. Even those are now pessimistic who have hitherto been staunch optimists, sound in the faith that the Motherland would 'somehow or other muddle through' and brilliantly emerge from threatened disaster, as she often has before in her long, chequered and illustrious history.

There is obviously much in the present situation calculated to depress; but whether the true plucky Briton falls from optimism—his normal condition—to pessimism depends upon whether he looks backward or forward, as, when human society is viewed as a whole, a look forward to ideal conditions turns us to pessimists, bewailing its manifest shortcomings, failures, and proofs of barbarism; while the look backward reassures us that humanity has crawled upward,

and must continue to rise, that all goes well, though slowly, and we are again healthily optimistic.

So with the anxious Briton just now in regard to industrialism. What a picture he gazes upon as he looks backward! He sees his country not only the greatest of all, but in many of the elements of power—in finance, in commerce, manufacturing, mining, weaving and shipping—contending successfully with all other nations combined, Britain in the one scale and the world in the other. It is only fifty-five years since she ceased to mine more coal than the rest of the world, and men still in active life have seen her manufacturing more iron and steel, weaving by machinery more cotton, woollen and linen cloth, owning more ships, and making more machinery than all others, and first in wealth and credit. The steam-engine, bringing steamship navigation and railway transportation; the hot-blast and puddling furnace—the roots of modern ironmaking; the Bessemer, Siemens-Martin and Thomas processes—the foundations of steelmaking; Arkwright and Hargreaves, the founders of machine weaving—all these, and others of like importance in other branches of production, the work of his land alone, no other making any considerable contribution to manufacturing progress; Britain the lonely pioneer who guided the world and led her to modern industrialism.

Is it to be wondered at if the proud Briton were sometimes prone to imagine that he must be made of different clay from men of other lands, and the natural ruler of others, appointed to furnish them with manufactured articles which they did not, could not, and never were intended to produce? If he ever did so, let him be pardoned, for he had every reason to believe the race capable of anything which had performed such miracles and given to the world the inventions which have revolutionised its material conditions. His country then stood surveying other lands which were under its indomitable sway in many of the most important fields of human activity, a giant among pigmies; and not only in the domain of industrialism was her position commanding. Splendid triumphs in regions infinitely higher, notably in the development of civil and religious liberty, of government by the people, and in the colonial field, could readily be adduced, were such within the scope of this paper. 'I am a Roman' carried little with it compared to all that lies in 'I am a Briton.'

Such the picture which made the optimistic, perchance egotistic, Briton. But let this be said to his credit: no man of any other strain could have gazed upon such a picture of his country's achievements, masterdom, and service to the world, and yet carry himself upon the whole with more dignified, unvaunting modesty, too proud to bluster.

Turn now from the view backward, and behold present conditions, and, presto! What a change! the optimist exclaims. No longer

Britain *versus* the world in anything, no longer even first among nations in wealth or credit,* in manufacturing, mining, weaving, commerce. Primacy lost in all. In seagoing ships still foremost, but even there our percentage of the world's shipping growing less every year.¹ It only increased 46,000 tons in five years from 1894 to 1899, and was 9,000 tons less in 1898 than in 1896. Worse than all, supremacy lost upon the sea in fast monster steamships—those unequalled cruisers in war, which now fly the German flag, all built in Germany; not one corresponding ship built or building in Britain, the field entirely surrendered to her rival. In ironmaking, Germany has risen from 1,500,000 to 7,000,000 tons per year, while Britain has stood still, her highest product being 9,500,000 tons. The United States made 13,500,000 tons last year, to be exceeded this year, while we are making less than last.

In steel, the United States made 10,638,000 tons last year, and have made this year, so far, more than last, while we are falling back from our maximum of 5,000,000 tons of last year.

In textiles, Lord Masham tells us in the *Times* that we are exporting less and importing more. In 1891 we exported 106 millions, in 1899, 102 millions sterling; in 1891 imported of textiles 28 millions, and in 1899, 33 millions sterling. His Lordship avers that Great Britain has not increased her export trade one shilling for thirty years:

Financially we are also rapidly losing primacy. The daily operations of the New York Exchange exceed those of London. Our loans at a discount find investors in the United States, which, so long our greatest debtor, is becoming our chief creditor nation. We offer everyone who has confidence to subscribe our national note for 100% if he will give us 93% 14s. cash; Consols were at 113, and are now below 95; we spend in two years as much upon what was expected to be a mere parade as the reductions made in the National Debt for fifty years; and the war is still costing 1½ million sterling per week, soon to be increased by new levies at increased pay. We have just added 11 millions per year to our taxes when America, by a singular coincidence, has just reduced taxes by that amount. Britain thus handicapped more, and our rival's weight lessened for the industrial race.

We shall not very long be allowed even the boast of having the largest city of the world, since New York has to-day 3½ against London's 4½ millions; and the population of the area now New York increased last decade 35 per cent., while London's increase is only one-fourth as great. At rate of increase for the last five years New York in 1910 will almost equal London, in 1915 outstrip her.

While we have stood still, United States exports of manufactured articles have trebled in five years, and now reach 80 millions sterling. Our total exports in 1890 were 263,531,000%, and never again reached

* Figures in this paper from *Statesman's Year Book* 1900.

that sum until 1899, when by adding 6 millions for ships built for foreigners, not hitherto included, the exports were 264,660,000*l.* Our imports increased during that period 65 millions, partly because we became more and more dependent upon foreign nations for food.

Until recently foremost in machinery making, our tramways and subways are now equipped not only with electrical devices, but with the huge steam-engines required, imported from America. France shows exports of motor cars, &c., last year valued at 1 million sterling; we export none, and even buy from France.

The former optimist, now a miserable pessimist, continues his lament. As for shipbuilding, how long is primacy even in that to be left us when ship-plates from America reach Belfast and Glasgow by the thousands of tons, and to-day America is building two 18,000-ton ships? The cable announces the launch of the first, and two others are contracted for, of 20,000 tons, equal to the monster *Celtic*.

Our industrial army proves as much out of date as our war army is acknowledged to be; our railways at home and in our Colonies order their rails, bridges, and steel cars from America. Our men either cannot or do not work like the American, as the *Times* Special Commissioner has proved, neither do our captains of industry compare with those in America.

Our military army system, having broken down, is to be reconstructed. The *Times* publishes a letter from Captain Lee, M.P., ex-Military Attaché at Washington, and editorially says Captain Lee

declares that the American recruits are immeasurably superior to our ordinary recruits, both in physique and intelligence. Their average age is nearly twenty-three; average height of infantry 5 feet 8½ inches; all of them can read and write; special inquiries are made into their character; and Captain Lee affirms that in peace and war they are practically free from serious crime, and that he has never seen an American soldier drunk. Lord Lansdowne finds 92,000 of our recruits unfit.

Such the choice morsels from press and magazine upon which the discouraged Briton feeds. There are many others of similar import; but having now quoted from a recent issue of the *Times*, we shall close the list, although the pessimist no doubt continues to dwell upon the contrast presented between the backward and the present view, meeting all that is offered in mitigation or explanation with Hamlet's exclamation, 'Look here, upon this picture, and on this.' He will not be comforted. Yet comfort is near, which, with your readers' permission, we shall venture to offer; but before the proper stage of receptivity can be reached by our pessimistic friend one step is indispensable. He must adjust himself to present conditions, and realise that there is no use in these days dwelling upon the past; and especially must he cease measuring his one country with the forty-five countries of the American Union, *E pluribus unum*. It is out of the question to compare 41 millions of people

upon two islands, 127,000 square miles in area, with over 500 people per square mile (England and Wales), with 77 millions upon 3½ million square miles, unequalled in natural resources, with only 30 people per square mile.

Let us proceed, therefore, upon the only reasonable basis, that of man for man, and see what follows, taking up the pessimistic points in order.

First, loss of wealth and credit. Primacy of the world is gone in aggregate wealth only if the pessimist persists in measuring Britain and the American Union, which does not approach Great Britain in wealth man for man; with nearly double the population it has only one-fifth more wealth in the aggregate. No other nation is in the race for primacy with Britain, even in aggregate wealth. Not much cause for pessimism here, surely.

Loss of credit is serious; but what national credit except Britain's could stand an expenditure of four times more than its increase of revenue from the same taxes for twenty years, up to 1896, and on top of that, for five years succeeding up to 1901, increased expenditure of no less than 28 millions sterling per year, when the taxes yielded only 16 millions increase. The strongest proof of British credit is that it is not destroyed; no other nation could have so recklessly disregarded the plainest dictates of sound finance, in the face of the warnings of successive authorities, none more stern than those of the present able and courageous Chancellor of the Exchequer. No matter how a loyal press may claim unimpaired credit, the lender says that 6½ per cent. of the amount advanced must be deducted because credit is impaired. The Chancellor tells the world that the limit of present taxes is about reached, and that trade is not expanding.

The final reply to the pessimist here is that the British people will soon be compelled to change the policy of seeking increased responsibilities throughout the world, of provoking wars, and antagonising not only the Governments, but—a new and portentous fact—the peoples of other countries, a policy which inevitably demands the increased expenditures which have already lost for Britain her proud boast of supremacy in credit—a loss of genuine prestige.

The back of the weary Titan was already bent when he decided to increase his burden by acquiring acknowledged paramountcy in South Africa. Two young Republics certified to be dead were annexed, but the Titan still finds them struggling on his back. Whether the present war was inevitable or not is not here in question. If it were inevitable, so much more chary should Britain be in assuming responsibilities hereafter in distant parts of the world which carry in their train such tasks; for all must see that it is exposing Britain to dangers from other quarters which may at any time reverse the present figures of Consols. The wonder is not that these have fallen to 95, but that they have remained so high. With a

return to the policy of peace and goodwill towards other nations, and ordinary prudence in not awakening sleeping dogs, and also in expenditure, credit will soon be regained. No irretrievable disaster has yet occurred, but the danger signal is up.

Even in credit there is only the United States whose credit is better, as shown by the prices of its bonds; but were it to go one-half the distance on the road to financial troubles which Britain for years has traversed, it is improbable that even she could borrow upon the terms of the last addition to the British debt. Primacy in credit may yet be regained.

In mining, weaving, commerce, and manufactures primacy has gone only if the pessimist persists, as before, in measuring Britain against the whole American Union. No other nation robs her of primacy in either of these departments, nor is likely to do so. She has still primacy in the aggregate, even against the Union, in weaving and foreign commerce, and in exports she is not much behind. Not much cause for discontent here, since against a Union of forty-five States she still holds first place in two, and is abreast in another department.

In foreign shipping, it is true, Britain's former huge percentage of the world's shipping declines. How could it be otherwise? But it still exceeds that of any nation twice over. Her lead is so decided that no man living is likely to see it overcome. She had 9 million tons of shipping in 1898; the American Union had less than 5 millions, Germany 1,700,000, and France less than a million. No cause for lying awake o' nights mourning over the position of Britain in shipping.

So with the shipbuilding industry. It is true America is fast increasing, and is building monster war and merchant ships, and that Germany is also, and that both will prove competitors; but when Britain builds 865,000 tons per year (1898), and America only 249,000, and Germany—although figures are not at hand—certainly much less, probably not half, it is rather premature to take alarm. Britain needs and uses more ships than any other nation, having coal and manufactures to export and bulky food-products and raw materials to import. She need not be pushed out of primacy in shipowning, for, not needing to import so much, America is at a disadvantage with Britain, who has better loads for foreign ports throughout the world, out and home, for her ships. Therefore, if Britain loses primacy in shipowning, she will well deserve to lose it. In shipbuilding it is before long to be another matter. She must not fall asleep, for America, with her cheap steel and timber and surprising workmen, is finely equipped. Here, if Britain hold supremacy, she will richly deserve the prize.

As for the serious loss of the Atlantic express travel, a few words will explain why this was inevitable, keeping in view Britain's

environment. The British steamship lines sailing between Liverpool and New York convey passengers to and from Britain only, with her 41 millions of people. The German lines sailing from Bremen, Hamburg, to New York, draw first from the whole of Northern Europe, then touch at Southampton and draw part of the British travel, and, not content with this augmentation, crossing to Cherbourg, they draw from Paris and all Southern Europe. Thus three fine streams of travel feed their enormous fast ships; the 300 millions of Europe are tributary to them; and homeward from America to Germany they draw all who wish to visit or have business with any of these millions, for the homeward ships touch also at Cherbourg, Southampton or Plymouth, and land passengers. Against this the British lines have only tributary to them $41\frac{1}{2}$ millions of people who desire passage to New York, and, returning from America to Britain, only those Americans who desire to visit the $41\frac{1}{2}$ millions for pleasure or business. It goes without saying that the German lines must inevitably lead in large fast steamers. But no cause for pessimism here, because British shipowners are neither unenterprising nor inefficient; they only show their good sense by recognising the situation, and will hold more of the profit of Atlantic travel for Britain than if they attempted the impossible. • •

In ironmaking, Germany's $56\frac{1}{2}$ millions of people may probably ere long equal Britain's make, as Germany is gaining in population rapidly. But this does not mean any reduction of Great Britain's output; it may even increase somewhat. Her make, man for man, will remain greater than that of any country except the United States. What more can be expected? So with steel. Britain's 5 million tons product last year was nearly half as much as that of the United States, and not much behind, man for man, a remarkable fact taking conditions into account, showing the little giant that Britain is. No other nation compares with her in steel, even in the aggregate. No cause for pessimism here; but an unreasonable man can, of course, easily lament his country's decadence, because it produces 5 millions instead of $10\frac{1}{2}$, which half a continent produces.

We come now to the question, 'Is British foreign trade declining?' This has been the subject of much discussion of late, without result, because the question has two parts, which disputants usually ignore. Exports are one branch, imports another; the former has decreased *per capita*, and the latter increased. The two combined show that British foreign trade is not declining. From 1889-98, ten years, exports per head declined from 6*l.* 13*s.* 11*d.* to 5*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.*, and imports increased from 1*l.* 10*s.* 1*d.* to 1*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* These were mostly years of low prices; quantities did not decrease materially. The recent rise in prices has swollen the value of both imports and exports, but as a rule material increase of quantities is not shown,

except in greater imports of foreign food supplies. Even in these, however, higher prices account for some part of the increase.

Studying the subject carefully, and avoiding the tendency to generalise from temporary causes and values covering only this year or that, the writer is satisfied that the true answer to the question, 'Is British trade declining?' is that it cannot be affirmed to be either declining or increasing, imports and exports combined. It has apparently reached its limit, and is not expanding, having remained practically stationary for, say, ten years.

It surprises the writer that so much importance is attached in Britain to the monthly statement of exports and imports, as if increase or decrease in these were conclusive proof of prosperity or otherwise. Decreased exports may prove that home consumption is greater—the best of all conditions. Thus the steel exports of America this year will be less than last, because her own demands are greater. Happy country that can use its productive capacity for its own further development! Every ton used for additions or new undertakings is productive of more productive wealth. Exports decrease, but what goes abroad permanently develops directly the receiving nation, and only benefits the exporting nation temporarily by its manufacture. What is used at home develops the producing nation, and benefits it permanently. So with imports. A decrease in these may prove that the nation is more and more supplying its own wants. Happy nation that can do so! American imports are growing less and less for this reason, and reducing the volume of her foreign trade, a sign of continued development at which she rejoices. Last year was one of great prosperity for British manufactures. Exports of these in many lines declined, but the decrease in quantities of exports was the best proof of prosperity. There is another point often overlooked in considering exports, viz. that these are in the aggregate not to be compared with the amounts consumed at home. It is estimated that only one-eighth of Britain's production is exported. But if we consider only manufactured articles, we find that in pig iron 9 million tons are made and only 1 million exported. In coal, less than one-sixth goes abroad: 220 million tons produced, 36 million tons (average) exported. In textiles, of linen, one-fourth exported, 20,000,000*l.* produced, 5,000,000*l.* exported; in woollen goods, product 50,000,000*l.*, 14,000,000*l.* only exported. In cotton goods alone does the amount exported reach the amount consumed at home. The total annual exports average 235,000,000*l.*; if we estimate 12 per cent. profit upon these, the gain is 28,000,000*l.* The increase in national expenditures during five years, not including the present war cost, is just this figure; therefore, should such expenditure become permanent, the gain arising from all the exports of Britain has been absorbed chiefly in supposed empire-making and its inevitable armaments. 'The vast interests of Britain in China' are much in evidence at

present, but shrink upon examination. The amount that China takes of British products is only 5,000,000*l.* per annum. Little Holland takes one-half more, and so does little Belgium; and the Brazilian and the Venezuelan republics each take more. A very big war can easily be stirred up there, costing thousands of lives and a hundred millions or two, which cannot well be spared, all in the cause of protecting a paltry five millions worth of trade, yielding, perhaps, 600,000*l.* or 700,000*l.* per annum profit. Nor is Chinese trade likely to increase much, for the Chinese need little that is made by Western nations. Great increase of her consumption of British goods is not probable, in the opinion of the writer, who has some knowledge of that strange land.

It is pitiable to see so many lives lost and so much money squandered in pursuit of shadowy dominion over barren territory in far-off, sparsely populated lands, ostensibly to secure new markets for British products. The markets of uncivilised lands amount to so little, and Britain has no advantages from her nominal sway under the policy of free trade; for trade does not follow the flag—it follows the lowest price current. Loyal Canada buys three times as much from the United States as from Britain. Even her Union Jacks she buys in New York. If 2*s.* 6*d.* per year were added to the purchasing power of the British people for home products, the market would be enlarged to the extent of all its exports to China; less than 6*d.* per head would equal the profit. One pound per head would give Britain more new trade than her total exports to India and South and East Africa combined; or to Canada and Australia, China and Japan combined; to Germany, Italy and France combined; or to the United States, Brazil, Argentine and Canada combined, and equal to one-half of the total export trade to all British possessions, which is 80,000,000*l.* per year. If the 28,000,000*l.* of increased Government expenditure per year incurred during the past five years were stopped, and spent by the people at home upon British products, this would give a new market equalling that of Canada, South and East and West Africa, Foreign Africa, South and East, and the West Indies, Ceylon and Hong Kong. Conquering new territory for markets abroad is dropping the substance for the shadow—chasing rainbows. The case against this policy is closed. Trade has not increased. The true statesman will soon turn his attention to the bettering of conditions at home, for it is here that the greatest increase of British trade can most easily be effected. A profitable home market is the strongest weapon that can be used to conquer markets abroad.

Prominent speakers sometimes state that Britain is lightly taxed. Compared with Germany and the American Union this is certainly incorrect, and it is these countries which Britain has most to fear industrially. It is not intended to convey the idea that Britain's

taxes can possibly be as low per head as those of the United States, but the fact that they cannot be so is an additional reason for weighing carefully the resources of the country.

The British Government's expenditure is now close upon 3*l.* per head; that of the United States 1*l.*,² the cost of the Spanish and South African wars being each excluded. Here is a load of about 80,000,000*l.* per year for the United Kingdom, nearly 2*l.* per head with which the 41½ millions of Britons are handicapped. This is nearly three times the total direct profit made at 12 per cent. upon Britain's entire exports. The German only pays 1*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* per head.

The last fiscal year left the Republic with a surplus of sixteen millions sterling after paying ordinary expenditures and the cost of the Philippine war also. Hence the remission of taxes to the extent of eleven millions sterling. The Secretary of the Treasury is buying up Government bonds with his surplus revenues. The amount of gold in the Treasury was never so great—it recently approached a hundred millions sterling. After British employers and employed reach the American standard of economical production, Britain will still remain heavily handicapped in the industrial race by the enormous load of taxation under which her producers labour as compared with America. It seems to the writer that this should be one, if not the chief, controlling factor in determining the world-policy of the nation. It must soon force itself upon statesmen.

The debt of the States of the American Union is now only 202 million dollars in the aggregate, having fallen from 298 million dollars in 1880. This is less than a million sterling per State, and takes no account of the sinking funds, which in many cases almost equal the debt. The American is surprisingly careful about incurring debts, the States and cities being constitutionally prohibited from exceeding certain percentages upon the property assessment. He is in strong contrast to the Canadian and Australian in this respect.

The backwardness of Britain in electrical machinery and equipment, motor cars, &c., is due to the natural conservatism of the race. The French are more disposed to experiment with novelties, and the maker there sees a home demand, which is, as just stated, the surest foundation for capturing the foreign market. Britain may still overtake her quicker neighbour—her new plants should soon drive out the latest industrial invader; then exports will begin. It is not always he who starts first who ends first. The writer expects Britain soon to be in the front rank here.

² In giving the expenditure of the United States Government at 1*l.* per head the years previous to the Spanish war are taken. Taxes to the extent of 11,000,000*l.* have since been abolished, equal to three shillings per head. It is but fair, however, to say that last year's permanent appropriations were greater than before the war, and annual expenditure will be somewhat over 1*l.* to-day, notwithstanding the reduction of taxes named.

The armies of Britain, industrial and military, are the next problem which troubles the pessimist. Their inefficiency arises from the same cause—neither has had foes worthy of its steel in recent times, the industrial never till now. Both employer and employed retain much of the easy-going indifference generated by the past monopoly of production. The military army has not faced civilised white foes for more than a generation. It has won glorious victories very easily by shooting down thousands armed with spears, producing in the victors the dangerous impression that 25,000 British troops could march anywhere and do anything. Upon trial methods and equipment were found behind the times like those of the industrial army. Both have been playing at work. The writer (the Hon. George Brodrick) of *A Nation of Amateurs* in this Review for October 1900 hits the nail on the head. It is as if Arthur Balfour and Herbert Gladstone challenged Vardon and Taylor, and fondly imagined they could score.

But that is not the end of the matter. The qualities of the race lie dormant, and are still there: the dogged endurance, the ambition to excel, the will to do or die, are all there, but it has not been necessary to drill them into disciplined action. Let serious disaster come in industry or war; let British trade really be captured by others, and decline to the point of closing mills and bringing home to employer and employed that it is change or ruin; or let the sceptred isle be invaded and the hitherto self-satisfied amateur officer see in his army life not a fashionable pastime, but a serious profession like that of the navy, and the soldier that he has rifles instead of spears to face, and it is do or die for the salvation of his country, and the world will then see—but perhaps not till then—what wonders the race can still perform when it fights, not for shadowy paramountcy over others, but for home and country.

The blood has not deteriorated. We see how the British workman develops when, in competition with the American, in the mills of the Republic he takes his coat off.

Thus the industrial situation, sombre as it is, and dangerous as it might readily become, is not the chief source of danger to Britain to-day, because, after an awakening more or less rude, and in all respects salutary, it can well be left to work out its own salvation by adopting the changes required both by employer and workman, and which are quite within their power, to enable the country to maintain its trade in competition with others. It is the financial and political situation which is alarming, for it needs no prophet to foretell that a continuance of the aggressive temper which alienates other Governments and peoples, and which has mistaken territorial acquisition for genuine empire-making, must soon strain the nation's power and lay upon its productive capacity such burdens as will render it incapable of retaining the present volume of trade, which is essential to the

preservation of Britain's position as foremost in the world, financially, commercially, and industrially (American Union, *hors concours*).

If ever a nation had clear and unmistakable warnings, as the writer thinks, that the time has arrived when it should henceforth measure its responsibilities and ambitions throughout the world with its resources, and cut its garment according to its cloth, it is the dear old Motherland of the race, with its trade stationary, an army of thirty thousand men or more to be provided for in South Africa, even after peace comes, its expenditures and taxation increasing, and its promises to pay already at such a discount as to attract capital from across the Atlantic. Rocks ahead, sure enough; but this does not mean that the officers of the ship of State are to drive it full steam upon them. On the contrary, it should mean that the rocks, being now in sight, will be avoided.

The prime quality of the race—its 'saving common-sense,' inherent in men of all parties—may be trusted to see that the good ship Britannia so steers her course hereafter as to ensure her safety and to keep her strong for the many long and prosperous voyages she is destined yet to sail, not only for her own advantage, or that of the English-speaking race, but, as the writer has never ceased to believe, for the advantage of the world as a whole.

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

IMPRESSIONS OF AMERICA

If you would fully grasp all that the geographical conditions of the American continent imply, you should cross the Atlantic in its winter gales, and travel far to the west with the thermometer sinking down towards zero. No imagination can bring home to you this vast isolation and this boundless expanse, until, for some eight days, you have watched your great ship as it ploughs across these inexhaustible waters at the rate of a South-Eastern Railway train, seeing nothing but waves, clouds and sky, so that the lonely monotony of this enormous ocean seems to try the nerves at last. And then, when the express train thunders on, day and night, across the Allegheny mountains to the west, a journey that would suffice to cross Europe just brings you over but a fraction of the space that divides the Atlantic from the Pacific.

Make this voyage and try to conceive what it must mean to the ordinary emigrant rather than to the luxurious tourist, and you will begin to understand how far outside of Europe is this American continent; how completely it offers a new life, a fresh start, a world detached, on a virgin soil unencumbered with our antique civilisation and its burdens. Again, make this westward journey by rail, and watch how the emigrant has to make it, and you feel an awakening sense of the boundless area, the inexhaustible resources, the infinite varieties of the transatlantic hemisphere, which for practical purposes has only just begun to take its place in these latter days in the secular life of humanity as a whole.

America is detached from Europe by a gulf which, however trivial it seems to the summer tourist in his luxurious stateroom and saloon, has been a veritable 'middle passage' to millions and millions of American citizens and their parents—a gulf which the 'Upper Ten thousand' cross backwards and forwards as we go to Paris or Rome, but which seventy millions of American citizens never cross or re-cross. To them our Europe is a far-away world, of which but faint echoes reach them, which they will never see more, which can never directly touch their lives; whilst the vast expanses and inexhaustible resources of their own continent are brought home to them, day by day, in a thousand practical and visible ways.

And yet the paradox strikes my mind that American life, such as a passing visitor finds it in the great cities, is essentially the same as our own; that, in spite of the geographical isolation and the physical conditions, the citizen of the United States is at heart much the same man as the subject of King Edward; that life is the same, *mutatis mutandis*; that the intellectual, social, and religious tone is nearly identical; that the proverbial differences we hear of have been absurdly exaggerated. Put aside trivial peculiarities of language, manners, habit or climate, admit a certain air of Paris in New York, and a certain European tone in Washington—and these only concern small sections in both cities—for my part I noticed no radical difference between Americans and Englishmen. Physically, they are the same race, with the same strength, energy, and beauty; except for superficial things, they live the same lives, have the same interests, aims and standards of opinion; and in literature, science, art and philosophy, the Atlantic is less of a barrier between our two peoples than is St. George's Channel or the Tweed in the British Isles. The citizen of the United States seems to me very much what the citizen of the United Kingdom is—only rather more so. The differences are really on the surface, or in mere form.

I do not forget all that we are told about the vast proportion of non-American people in the United States, that New York and Chicago contain 'more Germans than any city but Berlin, more Irishmen than Dublin, more Italians than Venice, more Scandinavians than Stockholm, and' (they sometimes add) 'more sinners than any place but H—ll.' Statistics give us the facts, and of course there is no sort of doubt about the immense degree in which the States are peopled by a race of foreign birth or origin. In the eastern slums of New York, in the yards and docks of the great cities, one sees them by myriads: Germans, Irish, Italians, Swedes, Russians, Orientals, and negroes. But those who direct the State, who administer the cities, control the legislatures: the financiers, merchants, professors, journalists, men of letters—those whom I met in society—are nearly all of American birth, and all of marked American type. I rarely heard a foreign accent or saw a foreign countenance. The American world is practically 'run' by genuine Americans. Foreigners are more *en évidence* in London or Manchester, it seemed to me, than they are in New York, Philadelphia, or Boston.

My own impression is (of course, I can pretend to nothing but an *impression* at a first glance) that in spite of the vast proportion of immigrant population, the language, character, habits of native Americans rapidly absorb and incorporate all foreign elements. In the second or third generation all exotic differences are merged. In one sense the United States seemed to me more homogeneous than the United Kingdom. There is no State, city, or large area which has a distinct race of its own, as Ireland, Wales, and Scotland have, and

of course there is nothing analogous to the diverse nationalities of the British Empire. From Long Island to San Francisco, from Florida Bay to Vancouver's Island, there is one dominant race and civilisation, one language, one type of law, one sense of nationality. That race, that nationality, is American to the core. And the consciousness of its vast expansion and collective force fills the mind of American citizens, as nothing can do to this degree in the nations of western Europe.

Vast expansion, collective force, inexhaustible energy—these are the impressions forced on the visitor, beyond all that he could have conceived or had expected to find. It is borne in on him that he has come, not so much to another nation as to a new continent, inhabited by a people soon to be more numerous than any two of the greater nations of western Europe, having within their own limits every climate and product between the Tropics and the Pole, with natural resources superior to those of all Europe put together, and an almost boundless field for development in the future. Europeans, being in touch with the eastern seaboard, do not easily grasp the idea how fast the population, wealth, and energy of the United States are ever sweeping to the west. It is an amusing 'catch' when one is told that the central point of population of the United States is now at Indianapolis, nearly a thousand miles west of Boston; that the geographical centre of the United States since the acquisition of Alaska is now west of San Francisco. It is long since an Eastern State man has been elected President, and we are told that there will never be another. The political centre of gravity is now said to lie in the Mississippi Valley. And the destined metropolis of the United States will soon be Chicago or St. Louis. Chicago, with its unlimited area for expansion north, west, and south, and its marvellous site on the vast inland seas, may prove to be, in a generation, the largest, richest, and most powerful city in the world.

Chicago, to which I was invited to give the annual address in commemoration of George Washington, was the first city in the United States in which I sojourned; and it naturally interested me much. It did so, amongst other things, because I am older than the city itself. At my own birth, I learn, it was a village in a swamp with 100 inhabitants, and I heard of a man now living who has killed bear on the site of the Central Lake Park. Although it is said to extend over a space of some thirty miles, it has vast edifices of twenty stories, and its banks, offices, public buildings and halls show a lavish profusion of marbles, granite, and carved stone. It is not a beautiful city, though it has great natural opportunities on its level lake shore; and perhaps, as whole streets have been bodily raised upwards by machinery many feet, it is conceivable that it may be made a fine city in time.

Chicago struck me as being somewhat unfairly condemned as devoted to nothing but Mammon and pork. Certainly, during my visit, I heard of nothing but the progress of education, university endowments, people's institutes, libraries, museums, art schools, workmen's model dwellings and farms, literary culture, and scientific foundations. I saw there one of the best equipped and most vigorous art schools in America, one of the best Toynbee Hall settlements in the world, and perhaps the most rapidly developed university in existence. My friends of the Union League Club, themselves men of business proud of their city, strongly urged me to dispense with the usual visit to the grain elevators and the stockyards, where hogs and oxen are slaughtered by millions and consigned to Europe, but to spend my time in inspecting libraries, schools, and museums. No city in the world can show such enormous endowments for educational, scientific, and charitable purposes lavished within ten years, and still unlimited in supply.

In a country like the United States, where every principal city is struggling to become the first, and every second-rate town is struggling to reach the front rank, there is much jealousy between the competing cities. And Chicago, the youngest of the great cities of the world, is the butt of the wits of New York and Washington. I was, no doubt, fortunate in the conditions under which I saw it, but the impression left on my mind was that the citizens of Chicago were bringing their extraordinary enterprise to bear quite as much on social, intellectual, and artistic interests as they confessedly do on grain, ham, steel, and lumber. They will have to do so if they are to hold their own in the future of civilisation. For the manifest destiny of Chicago is to be the heart of the American continent.

For energy, audacity, and enterprise, the Chicago people are famous even in the Western States of America. 'When I come to London,' said a leading man of business, 'I find your bankers and merchants stroll into their offices between ten and eleven in the morning. I am at my desk at seven,' said he, 'and by noon I have completed fifty transactions by telephone.' Telegrams, in fact, are no longer up to date in the United States, and few busy men ever use a pen except to sign their names. They do not even dictate their letters. They speak into a phonograph, and have their message typewritten from the instrument. Life in the States is one perpetual whirl of telephones, telesems, phonographs, electric bells, motors, lifts, and automatic instruments. To me such a life would not be worth living, and the mere sight of it is incompatible with continuous thought. But business seems to be done in that way. And I did not learn that the percentage of suicide or insanity was very seriously increased by these truly maddening inventions.

No competent observer can doubt that in wealth, manufactures, material progress of all kinds, the United States, in a very few years,

must hold the first place in the world without dispute. Its population will soon double that of any nation of Western Europe. That population will have an education second only to that of Germany and Switzerland, and superior to that of any other European nation. The natural resources of their country exceed those of all Europe put together. Their energy exceeds that of the British; their intelligence is hardly second to that of Germany and France. And their social and political system is more favourable to material development than any other society ever devised by man. This extraordinary combination of national and social qualities, with vast numbers and unbounded physical resources, cannot fail to give America the undisputed lead in all material things. It is a curious instance of the power of national egotism that Europe fails to grasp this truth—that Germans, with their wretchedly poor country, narrow seaboard, and scanty rivers, ports, and minerals, still aspire to the first place; that Frenchmen fail to see how their passion for art, rest, and home has handicapped them in the race for supremacy in things material; that Britons, in their narrow island and their comfortable traditions, will not recognise that the industrial prizes must ultimately go to numbers, national unity, physical resources, geographical opportunities, trained intelligence, and restless ambition.

Enormous material triumphs obviously have their moral and intellectual evils. And one is constantly led to fancy some parallels between modern America and old Rome at the close of the Republic and the rise of the Empire. The sudden possession of vast areas to be exploited, the control of enormous masses of skilled workers, the rapid acquisition by men bred in hard work and having unbounded energy and ambition of all the resources the world can offer—these are common to the Rome of Cicero and Julius, and to the United States of Grover Cleveland and William McKinley. Paradox as it sounds, I was constantly reminded of the old stories of Crassus, Lucullus, and the Cæsars when I saw the lavish profusion of marbles, carvings, and mosaics in public and private buildings—so many a *porticus metata decempedis*—the wanton luxury which seems inspired by a mania of rapidly squandering the riches that have been so rapidly acquired. Wealth is acquired in Europe by slow stages and usually in more than one generation. In America it comes in a few years to men whose boyhood was usually passed in hardship or severe effort. The sudden mastery of enormous sources of power is the peculiar fact of American society—and its special form of temptation. It is often said, 'From shirt-sleeves to shirt-sleeves takes only three generations.' Such power is not seldom used well, generously, and with public spirit. Not seldom it is used ill, with vulgarity, folly, and selfishness. In any case, it knows nothing of the social conventions, habits, and traditions which, for good and for evil, control the use of wealth in modern Europe.

The characteristic note of the United States is to be found in this freedom of the individual—the *carrière ouverte aux talents*—in a sense which is unknown to Europeans and can hardly be conceived by them. Every one of these seventy millions—at least of whites—has an ‘equal chance’ in life. A first-rate education, comfort, and ‘betterment’ are within the reach of every youth and girl of average capacity and industry. Most of the men eminent in business, politics, or literature began life by ‘teaching school.’ Every messenger boy or machine-hand may be an embryo President of the United States, of a railroad, or a bank, a powerful journalist, or a millionaire. Every lad seems conscious that this is open to him, and most of them live and work as if they meant to try for this end. Every girl at a type-desk or a telegraph office may live to reside in Fifth Avenue, or—who knows?—in the White House. And the ease with which the youth and girl adapt themselves to new careers and wider functions is one of the wonders of American life. Europe, even France, is organised more or less on the caste system, where none but rare exceptions pass from one social rank or office to another from time to time. America is the only land on earth where caste has never had a footing, nor has left a trace. But this (be it said) is true only of the white race.

Rare as the prizes are, though the chances are millions to one against the winning, the possibility is ever before man, woman, and child. And this infinitesimal chance, this not absolutely impossible hope, colours life in the New World; so that, in spite of all the slum horrors of New York and Chicago, and all the industrial pressure of this furious competition, populist agitation, and anarchist outbreaks, the proletariat of Europe has good ground for looking to the United States as the paradise of Labour. New York, San Francisco, Chicago, and Philadelphia may swarm with the disinherited of other continents, but the standard of material well-being in the United States reaches for the masses of the labouring people a far higher and more permanent point than has ever yet been attained by the labouring mass of civilised men.

The ease with which men can pass from one locality to another, from one climate to another, from one business to another, the entire absence of social barriers or class distinctions, the abundant means of technical and scientific education, leave it open to each man and woman to make their own lives. The vast continent, with its varieties of climate and soil, produces almost everything except champagne, diamonds, and ancient buildings. With New York and San Francisco, the two grandest natural ports in the world, open to the ships of the Atlantic and the Pacific, with Chicago or St. Louis as the centre of traffic, the clearing-house of this boundless trade, the material prosperity of the American continent must reach in the twentieth century a height of which the nineteen centuries before

it never dreamed. When the Englishman talks about the evils of Protection and the benefits of Free Trade, he is reminded that the United States occupies a continent self-sufficing, except for a few luxuries, which has its own Free Trade on a gigantic scale, over an area far larger than all Western Europe. It seems impertinent to lecture men about their neglect of Free Trade, when in their own country they can travel in every direction thousands of miles without ever meeting a Customs frontier. They insist that they are the greatest Free Trade people on earth.

Of course, for the American citizen and the thoughtful visitor, the real problem is whether this vast prosperity, this boundless future of theirs, rests upon an equal expansion in the social, intellectual, and moral sphere. They would be bold critics who should maintain it, and few thinking men in the United States do so without qualifications and misgivings. As to the universal diffusion of education, the energy which is thrown into it, and the wealth lavished on it from sources public and private, no doubt can exist. Universities, richly endowed, exist by scores, colleges by many hundreds, in every part of the Union. Art schools, training colleges, technical schools, laboratories, polytechnics, and libraries are met with in every thriving town. The impression left on my mind is that the whole educational machinery must be at least tenfold that of the United Kingdom. That open to women must be at least twentyfold greater than with us, and it is rapidly advancing to meet that of men, both in numbers and in quality. Nor can I resist the impression that the education in all grades is less perfunctory, amateurish, and casual than is too often our own experience at home. The libraries, laboratories, museums, and gymnasia of the best universities and colleges are models of equipment and organisation. The 'pious founder' has long died out in Europe. He is alive in America, and seems to possess some magic source of inexhaustible munificence.

Libraries, of course, are not *learning*; museums and laboratories are not *knowledge*; much less is an enormous reading public *literature*. And, however much libraries may be crowded with readers, however spacious and lavish are the mountings of technical schools, and though seventy millions of articulate men and women can pass the seventh standard of a board school, the question of the fruit of all this remains to be answered. The passing visitor to the United States forms his own impression as to the bulk and the diffusion of the *instruments* of education; but he is in no better position than any one else to measure the *product*. The sight of such a vast apparatus of education, such demand for education, and that emphatically by both sexes, must create a profound impression. The Cooper Institute of New York, one of the earliest of these popular endowments, still managed and developed by three genera-

tions of the same family from its venerable founder, the Jeremy Bentham of New York, is a typical example of a people's palace where science, art, and literature are offered absolutely free to all comers. But what is the result? Few Americans pretend that, with all the immense diffusion of elementary knowledge of science in the United States, the higher science is quite abreast of that of Europe. Of scholarship, in the technical sense of the word, in spite of the vast numbers of 'graduates,' the same thing may be said. And no one pretends that American literature rivals that of France in its finer forms—or indeed that of England.

The reason for this is not obscure, and it is hardly covered by the ordinary suggestion that the American people are absorbed in the pursuit of gain and material improvement. However much this may react on the intellectual world, the numbers of the American people are so great that numerically, if not proportionately, those who are devoted to science, art, and literature are at least as many as they are in England. The vast development of material interests is rather a stimulus to the pursuit of science than a hindrance, as the vast multiplication of books is a stimulus to authorship. But why suppose that a general interest in practical science conduces to high scientific culture, or that millions of readers tend to foster a pure taste in letters? The contrary result would be natural. Practical mechanics is not the same thing as scientific genius. And the wider the reading public becomes, the lower is the average of literary culture.

But other things combine to the same result. The absence of any capital city, any acknowledged literary centre, in a country of vast area with scattered towns, the want of a large society exclusively occupied with culture and forming a world of its own, the uniformity of American life, and the little scope it gives to the refined ease and the graceful *dolce far niente* of European *beaux mondes*, all these have something to do with a low average of original literature.

The lighter American literature has little of the charm and sparkle that mark the best writing of France, because, apart from national gifts of *esprit*, American society does not lend itself to the daily practice of polished conversation. After all, it is *conversation*, the spoken thought of groups of men and women in familiar and easy intercourse, which gives the aroma of literature to written ideas. And where the arts of conversation have but a moderate scope and value, the literature will be solid but seldom brilliant.

But all these conditions, if they tend in the same direction, are perhaps of minor importance. The essential point is that literature of a high order is the product of long tradition and of a definite social environment. Millions of readers do not make it, nor myriads of writers, though they read the same books and use the same language and think the same thoughts. A distinctive literature is the

typical expression of some organised society, cultivated by long use and moulded on accepted standards. It would be as unreasonable to look for a formed and classical style in a young, inorganic, and fluid society, however large it may be and however voracious of printed matter, as to look in such a land for Westminster Abbeys and Windsor Castles. America will no doubt in the centuries to come produce a national literature of its own, when it has had time to create a typical society of its own, and intellectual traditions of its own.

Literature, politics, manners and habits, all bear the same impress of the dominant idea of American society—the sense of *equality*. It has its great side, its conspicuous advantages, and it has also its limitations and its weakness. It struck me that the sense of equality is far more national and universal in America than it is in France, for all the pæans to equality that the French pour forth and their fierce protestations to claim it. ‘Liberty, equality, and fraternity’ is not inscribed on public edifices in the United States, because no American citizen—or, rather, no white citizen—can conceive of anything else. The shoeblack shakes hands with the President, and (in the absence of a Pullman) travels in the same car with the millionaire. The millionaire has a very restricted household of servants, and they are more or less his masters, because the true-born American will not accept domestic service on any wages, and the Irish ‘helps’ are the despair of the housekeeper. The owner of a splendid mansion has to ascend ten steps to his own door, because Americans, and even Irish helps, decline to live in rooms below the level of the street. Thus the ground floor belongs to the domestic ‘auxiliaries.’ The middle-class American citizen has to black his own boots or walk out to a blacking stand, because American citizens will not perform so menial an office. All this has its fine side, though perhaps the reaction from European servility is carried to needless lengths. Is it natural, they say, that a lad who may live to be a senator or a President, to found a university, or to control a railroad, should black another citizen’s boots? Should a cookmaid who may live to drive her own carriage in Central Park put up with a cellar-kitchen below the level of the street? Every soldier of Napoleon carried a marshal’s *bâton* in his knapsack. And every American citizen has a Fortunatus’ cap in his pocket, if he only knew how to fit it on his head. And this he is perpetually trying to do.

But this ingrained sense of the absolute equality of all white citizens reacts on all things. The Congressman is, at Washington, a successful politician; but, outside Congress, he is one of seventy millions. A senator, a Cabinet minister, or a President, is merely a prominent citizen raised by ballot from the ranks, to return to the ranks when his term of office is up. The reaction from the divine right and hereditary privileges of the monarchies and aristocracies of

Europe has led to slipshod habits in public affairs which scandalise the Old World and go much deeper than mere outsiders.

Men who manage affairs of state in their shirt-sleeves are too apt to take a rough-and-ready view of life and of that which is becoming and right. As Mr. Bryce has so well said, the sense of *noblesse oblige*, which still survives in Europe as a force constraining men in high office or in great social position, has hardly any equivalent in American life. The want of commanding social influence by men of great reputation and acknowledged standing makes itself felt in national and municipal affairs, in manners, in business, and in literature. A certain philosopher who comes to England is wont to say at once, 'You have an organised society; our society is inorganic, and no class or group exercises any social influence.' All this has its bad side as well as its good side. So, in crossing the Atlantic, the observer finds that he has left a world more or less 'organised' for good or for ill, and has come to a society which, for good or for evil, is organised only as a huge electoral machine. Public men in America are commonly accused of accepting the moral standards of the mass and of tamely yielding to the voice of majorities. Their excuse is that their fellow-citizens would resent their setting up superior standards of their own, and flatly refuse to accept any leadership from them. Where in England a man of ambition is constantly aiming to gain 'influence,' and is constantly considering 'what is due to his own position,' in America he has little need to consider anything but what will satisfy the electors, and what is the average conscience of the larger number. He has no 'position' to maintain.

The ceremony of the Inauguration of the President and Vice-President at Washington on the 4th of March is, indeed, a characteristic and suggestive function. I had the good fortune to witness it this year under the most favourable conditions, and was deeply impressed with all it represented. It summed up the vast extent and power of the United States, its absolute democracy, the simplicity, ease, and homeliness of its government, its contempt of forms, its entire confidence in itself and perfect satisfaction with its own ways. In the grand Capitol of the noble city of Washington, than which no finer edifice or city exists in the Old World, were gathered the men chosen by the adult citizens of a nation of some seventy millions, scattered over a vast continent. The President, Vice-President, senators, and representatives elected on this enormous ballot, entrusted with this stupendous power and wealth, sat indistinguishable from the ordinary citizens around them—clerks, secretaries, journalists, and casual friends, who were crowded pell-mell on the floor of the Senate House itself.

To this miscellaneous body, which might be any average county council or borough board, there entered a long file of ambassadors and ministers in all the finery of European and Oriental courts;

uniforms blazing with gold lace, plumes, velvet or fur, swords, sabres, and helmets; the Austro-Hungarian magnate, the stately ambassadors of Great Britain, Germany, France, and Russia, in their court uniforms, stars, crosses, and ribbons; Mr. Wu Tifig-fang, the accomplished Minister of China, in his buttoned headdress and embroidered silks; the Japanese Minister, in European court uniform; the envoys of the smaller Powers of Europe, and then the diplomatists of the South American and Central American and West Indian States; black men, brown men, whitey-brown men, in various gaudy uniforms; the Minister of the Sultan in his fez, those of Siam and Korea in their national dress—more than thirty in all, in every colour, adornment, and style, representing men of every race, from every part of the planet.

This brilliant and motley group may be seen at St. Stephen's, or at the functions of Berlin and St. Petersburg, where it is only a natural part of similar bravery and feudal splendour. But here, in a hall crowded with sober citizens in broadcloth, without a star, a ribbon, or a sword between them, the effect was almost comic. Siam, Korea, Hungary, and Portugal as gay as butterflies! McKinley and Roosevelt matter-of-fact civilians, as if they were Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the London County Council! And around them were the chosen delegates of the great Republic, jostled in their own hall by pressmen, secretaries, and curious strangers like myself. The shirt-sleeve theory of government could hardly go farther, and, perhaps, need not go quite so far. My own republican soul was stirred when I set myself to think which of the two forms would prevail in the centuries to come. I thought first of the Roman Senate (according to the old myth), sitting immovable as statues in their white togas, when the Gauls of Brennus, in their torques and war-paint, dashed into the Senate House; and then I began to think, Were these quiet citizens seated there to see a comic opera at the Savoy Theatre?

Not that the representatives of the Republic are wanting in personal bearing. The President sate through the ceremonies with placid dignity, his fine features, in their stern repose, looking like a bronze figure of the Elder Brutus or Cato the Censor. But at a personal reception in the White House Mr. McKinley will show as much grace and courtesy of demeanour as any Sovereign by divine right, and his smile and his voice are pronounced (not only by women) to be perfectly winning. The diplomatists of Europe agree in assuring us that nothing can exceed the tact and 'correctness' which distinguish Mr. Hay, the accomplished Secretary of State. It is true that Congressmen (in their shirt-sleeves) have not that repose of manner which marks the caste of *Vere de Vere*. But the men who are charged to speak in the name of the State will usually be found to rise to the occasion with that facility which enables

every genuine American to adapt himself to play a new part, and to fulfil an unaccustomed duty.

It is no easy task to combine the conduct of vast interests, the representation of enormous power, with the ultra-democratic traditions of the absolute equality of all citizens. No sooner had the President summoned before him the splendiferous envoys of the whole world, than he passed out to the historic steps of the Capitol, to pronounce his Inaugural Address. As I stood near him and listened to the clear and keenly-balanced sentences, which the cables and telegraphs of the civilised world were carrying to expectant nations, I noticed how the crowd, a few feet only below him, was a miscellaneous gathering from the streets, like a knot in the Park listening to a Salvation preacher or a Socialist orator on a Sunday, negroes and lads not the least vociferous in their applause, whilst on a platform fifty yards off there were mounted a dozen batteries of photographers, from kodaks to life-size lenses. The American public man—even the private man and private woman—has always to reckon with the man in the street, journalists, and kodaks.

It is needless to point the moral of the difference between the Inaugural Address of a President, delivered in the open air to a miscellaneous crowd; and the speech of an European Sovereign opening Parliament. The one is an elaborate State paper, spoken by a citizen in frock-coat to a mob of his fellow-citizens in the street; the other is usually conventional platitudes, pronounced in a gorgeous palace with a scene of mediæval pageantry. It is the contrast between the monarchical survival and Republican realism. Kodaks, mobs, and vociferous negroes are not a necessary part of the government of a State. But the Presidential address from the steps of the Capitol is certainly more like that of Pericles on the Pnyx, or of Scipio and Marius on the Rostra, than our House of Lords; and it is conceivable that it may prove more agreeable to the practice of future republics in the ages to come. The President of the United States expounds his policy in a reasoned argument to all citizens who choose to hear him. The European monarch performs a traditional ceremonial to a crowd of stage courtiers who possess office without power and honour without responsibility.

The White House, as the executive mansion is called, is interesting for its historic associations, which exactly cover the nineteenth century, with its portraits and reminiscences of Presidents and statesmen, and its characteristic simplicity and modest appointments. It is not a convenient residence for a President with such great responsibilities. But, as the term of residence is usually so short, and the associations of the house are so rich, it would be a pity to change it for a pretentious modern palace. In the meantime the quiet old mansion, merely a fine Georgian country house in a pleasant park, serves to remind the American citizen of the demo-

cratic origin of his Chief Magistrate, who is certainly not yet an emperor. The White House was a residence suitable for men like Jefferson, Lincoln, and Grant; and it seems a not unfitting office for their successors.

The Capitol at Washington struck me as being the most effective mass of public buildings in the world, especially when viewed at some distance, and from the park in which it stands. I am well aware of certain constructive defects which have been insisted on by Ferguson and other critics; and no one pretends that it is a perfect design of the highest order either in originality or style. But as an *effective* public edifice of a grandiose kind, I doubt if any capital city can show its equal. This is largely due to the admirable proportions of its central dome group, which I hold to be, from the pictorial point of view, more successful than those of St. Peter's, the Cathedral of Florence, Agia Sophia, St. Isaac's, the Panthéon, St. Paul's, or the new Cathedral of Berlin. But the unique effect is still more due to the magnificent *site* which the Capitol at Washington enjoys. I have no hesitation in saying that the *site* of the Capitol is the noblest in the world, if we exclude that of the Parthenon in its pristine glory. Neither Rome nor Constantinople, nor Florence, nor Paris, nor Berlin, nor London possesses any central eminence with broad open spaces on all sides, crowned by a vast pile covering nearly four acres and rising to a height of nearly three hundred feet, which seems to dominate the whole city. Washington is the only capital city which has this colossal centre or crown. And Londoners can imagine the effect if their St. Paul's stood in an open park reaching from the Temple to Finsbury Circus, and the great creation of Wren were dazzling white marble, and soared into an atmosphere of sunny light.

Washington, the youngest capital city of the world, bids fair to become, before the twentieth century is ended, the most beautiful and certainly the most commodious. It is the only capital which has been laid out from the first entirely on modern lines, with organic unity of plan, unencumbered with any antique limitations and confusions. The spacious avenues, intersected by very broad streets, all lined with maple and elm, and radiating from a multitude of 'circles,' its numerous parks and squares, with fountains, monuments, and equestrian statues at each available junction, its semi-tropical climate, for it is in the latitude of Lisbon and Palermo, its freedom from the disfigurements of smoke, trade, and manufactures, its singular form of government under a State autocracy without any municipal representation, give it unique opportunities to develop. As yet it is but half completed, owing to local difficulties as to rights of property; and it still has the air of an artificial experiment in city architecture. But within two or three generations, when its vacant sites are filled up, and public buildings, monuments, and

statues continue to be raised with all the wealth, resources, and energy of the Republic, if the artists of the future can be restrained within the limits of good sense and fine taste, Washington may look more like the Rome of the Antonines than any city of the Old World.

Of all that I saw in America, I look back with most emotion to my visit to Mount Vernon, the home and burial-place of George Washington. I saw it on a lovely spring day, amidst thousands of pilgrims, in the Inauguration week. On a finely wooded bluff, rising above the grand Potomac River, stands the plain but spacious wooden house of the Founder of the Republic. It has been preserved and partly restored with perfect taste, the original furniture, pictures, and ornaments supplemented by fit contemporary pieces. It enables one perfectly to conjure up an image of the homely, large, and generous life of the President before the war called him to the field, and after he had retired from all cares of state. We fancy him sitting under the spacious eastern portico, with its eight tall columns, looking out over the broad landscape of forest and river, or lying in his last sleep in the simple bed, with its dimity coverlet, and then laid to rest in the rural tomb below the house, which he ordered himself, and in which his descendants have insisted on keeping his remains. General Grant lies beside the Hudson at New York, in a magnificent mausoleum palpably imitated from the tomb of Napoleon in the Invalides. How infinitely more fitting and more touching is the Spartan simplicity of Washington's burial place—an austere cell within his own ancestral ground; yet not a morning's drive from the splendid capital which the nation has named after its heroic founder—how much more fitting and more touching is this than is the Imperial mausoleum to which they have carried the bones of the tyrant who ruined France! It has been frequently attempted to remove the sarcophagus in which Washington lies from Mount Vernon, his home, to place it under the dome of the Capitol. But as yet it has been wisely decided to do nothing that can impair the unique legend which has gathered round the memory of the Western Cincinnatus.

In a country so flagrantly new as America, with every town and building striving to show its intense modernity, the few remnants even of eighteenth-century antiquity have a rare charm and a special value. They awaken an interest far beyond that of their actual beauty or quaintness, for they represent the only history of a country which has grown to be so vast and so different. Such relics as Mount Vernon, Independence Hall, and Carpenters' Hall at Philadelphia, the Common of Boston, the Green at Newhaven, and a few bits at Baltimore and old New York may still attract a traveller sated with the most picturesque corners of Europe. The history of the American soil is a very short record. But, such as it is, the American

people seem very keen to cherish it in perpetuity. If the preservation of Mount Vernon and of Independence Hall as national monuments is the finest example of this, the most amusing instance is the rescue of the wooden cottage of Betsy Ross in Arch Street, Philadelphia, where the original 'Star-spangled banner' was constructed in 1777 and approved by General Washington.

Few Englishmen seem to know the history of the 'Stars and Stripes.' In its original form it was a not ungainly device, adapted from the undoubted arms of the English family of Washington. These were: *argent*, two bars *gules*, on a chief three *mulletts* [stars] of the first [*argent*]. When the thirteen States of the Union resolved to adopt a national flag from the ancestral coat of their chief, this became 'barry of thirteen, *gules* and *argent*, on a chief *azure* thirteen mullets of the second arranged in circlet.' But when the other States were added the 'stars' began to be increased, until to-day the flag displays, on a canton *azure*, forty-five mullets *argent* in monotonous rows. Nothing more artless, confused, and unheraldic can be conceived.¹

America is making violent efforts to evolve a national architecture; but as yet it has produced little but miscellaneous imitations of European types and some wonderful constructive devices. A walk along the Broadway and Fifth Avenue of New York leaves the impression of an extraordinary medley of incongruous styles, highly ingenious adaptations, admirable artistic workmanship, triumphs of mechanics, the lavish use of splendid materials, and an architectural *pot-pourri* which almost rivals the *Rue des Nations* at the Paris Exhibition of 1900. There are some excellent copies of European buildings, such as the Giralda of Seville, Venetian palaces, Châteaux from Touraine, Palladian *loggie*, and here and there a German schloss. There are some beautiful revivals of fine art, such as the thirteenth-century Gothic of St. Patrick's, the Italian palaces of the Metropolitan and University Clubs, the Renaissance palaces of the Vanderbilts. Facing the Central Park, each millionaire seems to have commissioned his architect to build him a mansion of any ancient style from Byzantine to the last French Empire, provided only it was in contrast to the style of his neighbours. So commissioned, the artist has lavished skilful carving, singular ingenuity,

¹ An unlucky question was once put to me by a patriot, whether the 'Star-spangled banner' was not beautiful as a work of art. I was obliged to answer that, with all my veneration for the banner of the Republic, in my humble judgment it was (heraldically speaking) both awkward and ugly, unbalanced, undecipherable, and mechanical. It may be well to distinguish the Republican emblem from the feudal heraldry of the Old World. But it is a pity that the invention of the New World could not have devised an emblem with some claim to be clearly read and to look graceful. The thirteen *bars*, or stripes, have now lost their significance, and might in time disappear. A plain field, *semblé* of 'stars,' would not be unsightly nor too difficult to distinguish. Forty-five mullets on a canton in six regular rows are not easily visible at all, and, when perceived, are hardly elegant.

and noble material in stone, marble, and mosaic. Many of these are interesting experiments and some are beautiful; but the general effect of such rampant eclecticism is rather bewildering.

In constructive novelties the American builder is consummate. Amongst these are the Brobdingnagian piles of twenty stories, the substitution of lifts for staircases, the construction of edifices of steel, the profuse use of stone and marble as ornaments rather than as material, the multiplication of baths, heating apparatus, electric and other mechanical devices, and the intensely modern and up-to-date contrivances which put to shame the clumsy conservatism of the Old World. Nothing in Europe since the fall of old Rome and Byzantium, not even Genoa in its prime, has equalled the lavish use of magnificent marble columns, granite blocks, and ornamental stone as we see it to-day in the United States. The Illinois Trust Bank of Chicago—a vast marble palace—is, I suppose, the most sumptuous and one of the most beautiful commercial edifices in the world, and its safety deposit vaults are among the sights of that city.

The reckless use of precious marbles seems to threaten exhaustion of the quarries, but one is assured that they are ample for all demands. Why more use is not made in Europe of the magnificent marbles of America is not very obvious. But we certainly might easily adopt some of the constructive devices of their builders. Not, one trusts, the outrageous towers of Babel, in twenty or twenty-four floors and five hundred rooms, built of steel, and faced with granite as a veneer, which are seen in New York and Chicago, and hopelessly disfigure both cities. If these became general, the streets would become dark and windy cañons, and human nature would call out for their suppression. But the British architect has much to learn from modern American builders. In matters of construction, contrivance, the free use of new kinds of stone and wood, of plumbing, heating, and the minor arts of fitting, the belated European in America feels himself a Rip van Winkle, whirled into a new century and a later civilisation.

As to the two burning problems of American society—the Labour question and the Negro question—it would be idle for a passing tourist to pretend to an opinion of his own. Certainly, there is not visible in the United States, even in the slums of New York, Chicago, or Philadelphia, anything approaching the acuteness and extent of the destitution to be seen in London, Liverpool, or Glasgow. The slums of American cities are filled, it is true, with the waifs and strays, failures and outcasts from Europe, and are not of native American origin. But those who have made a comparative study of the life of the poor assure us that nowhere in the United States are the general conditions of the workman so threatening as they are too often in Europe, and the evils are certainly less difficult to cure. An influx of cosmopolitan misery has filled America with embarrassing problems, but the enormous resources of its continent, and the vast oppor-

tunities which its development affords, give Industry a free hand such as is elsewhere impossible and unknown.

The future of the Negro has always seemed to us in Europe the gravest of all American problems. And though I saw nothing to justify the extravagant stories we are told as to race antipathy and the ostracism of the Negro, I was surprised and shocked to hear from men of great cultivation and humanity such sweeping condemnation of the Negro race, such cool indifference to the continual reports of barbarous lynchings which appear almost daily in the public prints, and that in other than old Slave States. I should come to look on the race problem as incapable of any satisfactory solution were it not for such examples as that of Tuskegee and similar foundations. The life of Booker Washington, as told in his autobiography called *Up from Slavery*, is one of the most wonderful of our age. The story of the success in the education of the Negro achieved by this ex-slave, one of the most remarkable of living men, and by the white and coloured friends by whom he was assisted, should serve to convince us that the Negro problem may yet find a happy end.

About the prodigious luxury, extravagance, and money-making of the United States, of which we hear so much, a passing visitor has no right to dogmatise. America is a very rich country, where everything but raw material is very dear, where fortunes are made very rapidly, and where the scale of everything is raised in proportion. The sudden acquisition of wealth is more often the result of the vast numbers of those who deal in any market or buy any commodity, rather than of any abnormal development of the acquisitive instinct. The railroad, or corn, or oil 'boss' becomes a multi-millionaire in a decade owing to the colossal scale of the railroad, corn, and oil trades. There are perhaps more rich men in America than there are in Europe, but then there are not so many poor men. There are costly mansions in New York City, though none on the scale of Stafford House, Bridgewater House, and Dorchester House. And in the country there are no such royal palaces as Arundel Castle, Castle Howard, Longleat, and Mentmore. American millionaires do not own spacious parks, racing-studs, and deer-forests, nor are they surrounded by armies of tenants, dependents, servants, and equipages as are described in *Lothair*. They roll up fortunes, often automatically, owing to the wealth and numbers of the population in which capital operates. And they lavish their rapid gains sometimes in houses, paintings, yachts, and banquets, and not seldom in schools, observatories, and museums. But I saw nothing to suggest that wealth in America is worse acquired or worse applied than it is in Europe.

I must repeat that I am giving nothing but the first impressions of a passing visitor who spent two months in the United States for the first time in his life. Though I had special opportunities to see from the central point the official world, the universities, the literary

and the commercial society, I am well aware that I brought away nothing more than the thumbnail sketches of an impressionist. But my impression is that the accounts we too often get of American life are ridiculous exaggerations. English journalism distorts and magnifies the caricatures it presents, just as American journalism distorts and magnifies the traits of English life.

There are, no doubt, vices, blots, follies and social diseases on both sides of the Atlantic, but the proportion these bear to the nation is grossly overstated by sensational literature. As to the worship of the 'Almighty Dollar,' I neither saw it nor heard of it; hardly as much as we do at home. I may say the same as to official corruption and political intrigue. Congress, ministers, magistrates in the United States seemed to me to be a good deal of the same stuff as parliaments, cabinets, and judges with us. There are a few good journals; but the average Press seemed to me dull, trivial, provincial, and harmless, however insipid. The yellow Press, the brutal and gutter Press, I never saw nor heard of, nor did I meet any one who read it. New York, of course, has the vices of great cities, but they are not visible to the eye, and they are a drop in the ocean of the American people. Even the passing tourist must note the entire freedom of American towns from the indecencies that are paraded in European cities. The youngest girls go about the streets of New York alone; and a lady travels unattended from San Francisco to Washington. I received a deep impression that in America the relations of the sexes are in a state far more sound and pure than they are in the Old World; that the original feeling of the Pilgrim Fathers about woman and about man has sufficed to colour the mental and moral atmosphere, and to give all sexual problems a new and clear field to develop in normal ways.

I close my impressions with a sense that the New World offers a great field, both moral and intellectual, to the peaceful development of an industrial society; that this society is in the main sound, honest, and wholesome; that vast numbers and the passion of equality tend to low averages in thought, in manners, and in public opinion, which the zeal of the devoted minority tends gradually to raise to higher planes of thought and conduct; that manners, if more boisterous, are more hearty than with us, and, if less refined, are free from some conventional *morgue* and hypocrisy; that in casting off many of the bonds of European tradition and feudal survivals, the American democracy has cast off also something of the æsthetic and moral inheritance left in the Old World; that the zeal for learning, justice, and humanity lies so deep in the American heart that it will in the end solve the two grave problems which face the future of their citizens—the eternal struggle between capital and labour—the gulf between people of colour and the people of European blood.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

THE STANDARD OF STRENGTH FOR OUR ARMY:

A BUSINESS ESTIMATE

ONE of the difficulties of the discussions on Army Reform is how to make a bridge between the experts and the public whose support is invited by reformers. As regards the Navy, the public have been impressed by the idea that our Navy must equal in apparent magnitude the navies of any other two Powers. This idea is of course imperfect, as it may be necessary to have a navy equal to those of any other three or four Powers, and as it is also obvious that apparent may be a very different thing from real magnitude, and the public are not good judges on the point. The idea serves, nevertheless, as a pivot of discussion, and gives the public something tangible to go for. As regards the Army, however, there is nothing analogous. Should we have an army equal to a third or a fourth or any other proportion of the army of any one of the great military Powers; and if so, which? or should we have an army on the scale of one of the military Powers themselves? or should we have the magnitude of our Army fixed in some totally different way? There is the farther difficulty as to the magnitude of the army required on a peace footing and on a war footing respectively. This difficulty does not seem to exist as regards the great military Powers which are free from little wars, and whose armies are always potentially convertible from a peace to a war footing in so short an interval as to make the war footing the only one of real importance to be considered. But it is an unavoidable difficulty as regards the English Army, whose peace duties include little wars which are almost annual in their occurrence, and a constant state of preparedness for such wars. In what way, then, is a standard for the English Army to be arrived at, first on a peace footing, and next on a partial or full war footing, and what is the interval of time to be contemplated in arriving at the latter condition either in part or fully? It is to further an understanding on some of these points between the experts and the public that the present paper is written.

The starting-point of the discussion must, of course, be the preponderance of the Navy. The condition of the British Empire

without command of the sea is hardly conceivable. We should then be at the mercy of any Power which had such command. Our communications could not be maintained. We should be liable to blockade at home and to the ruin of our foreign commerce, nor could we keep India or any other dependency by force. We should be no worse off perhaps than Holland, which is in no condition to defend its independence or its empire against neighbouring States; but the condition of Holland is obviously, for many reasons, not a desirable one, while it may be doubted whether small States like Holland would be so numerous and prosperous as they are if there were not Powers like England capable of maintaining public international law against freebooting Powers. We start, then, with the idea of an army to be used in conjunction with a preponderant navy. What are the purposes for which such an army is required, and what numbers are needed first on a peace and then on a war footing?

The *first* use of an army is for purposes of defence against internal commotion. This statement may surprise some people who think of police only when questions of internal order are concerned and have not for many years witnessed the soldier in evidence in civil commotion or insurrection. But we shall have no true idea of what armies exist for unless we begin with this, perhaps in importance the highest, function of an army. The ultimate guarantee of civil order is, in fact, the soldier. The unarmed policeman is nothing without him, and no one can foresee how necessary the soldier may at any moment become. We have a standing illustration in the case of Ireland, where a police force is maintained which is really a military force, and with a large number of Regular soldiers behind it. Another illustration is just being given in South Africa, where the new police force is really being armed and organised as a military body with Regular forces behind it. An illustration of a different kind was afforded by the great civil war in America. If the United States had been able to dispose at the beginning of the war of a Regular army of 100,000 or even 50,000 men, there would have been no civil war. The losses and miseries of four years' civil strife, with its enormous waste of human lives, would have been entirely prevented. It is not cheap for a nation, therefore, even on the score of internal policy, to be without an irresistible army for all purposes of home defence. I put down, then, as the first object of an army, the maintenance of civil order in the State.

There is a special reason for mentioning this, as it is not unconnected with the problem or ideal of a general disarmament, of which one hears so much. The problem is quite insoluble, for the simple reason, among others, that internal conditions are everywhere different. Having regard to their own home conditions, the most orderly and law-abiding peoples might perhaps disarm completely, or nearly so, though the danger of so doing, as we have seen, was only

too strongly illustrated in the United States. But if they disarm they are immediately at a disadvantage internationally in dealing with States which are obliged by internal necessities to maintain large armies—States like France, or Austria-Hungary, or Russia, and many others. Thus the existence of States liable to internal disorder and which must maintain large armies initiates a competition in arming internationally which there is no means of getting rid of. We are saved from the international competition, or think we are saved, by a preponderant Navy; but we must not deplore the fact itself as if it were altogether preventible. I doubt if we can say that the expense of the additional armaments undertaken by some Governments beyond what is necessary for internal defence is in actual conditions a great or serious burden.

The *second* object of an army in an empire like that of England appears to be the garrisoning of the mother country so as to prevent raids upon fortified positions or depôts or commercial centres, or even raids of a wider range, at the outbreak of a war, and in the interval which may elapse before our preponderance at sea is converted into overwhelming superiority in fact by the defeat and destruction of the enemy's fleets. What kind of raid we should be prepared against, assuming our actual preponderance at sea, is of course a question of detail; but judging by the experience of history, and allowing for the greater mobility now given by steam as compared with the facility of movement formerly, I should say that we ought always to have in view in a great war with a naval Power the possibility of a descent of 20,000 or 30,000 men upon Ireland—in a war, for instance, between us and a Power like France, which has numberless soldiers and a considerable fleet at its disposal. Up to the limit stated, the launching against us of an expeditionary force which is prepared to face the prospect of being cut off or blockaded, for the sake of striking a serious blow and shaking the nerve of the English Government, seems always possible by way of surprise even without command of the sea by our enemy. Perhaps twenty large ships altogether, perhaps ten only, would suffice for the whole expedition, which might save bulky transport, for instance, by relying for a beginning of success on assistance in the shape of transport to be obtained in Ireland itself.¹ A similar expedition might suffice to punish any weakness of which we might be guilty in leaving places like Woolwich or Chatham or Portsmouth or any other of our stations insufficiently protected by land. The expeditionary force would know it was only sent on a forlorn hope, with almost the certainty of its being cut off; but that would not weigh, probably, with the Government sending it, if great destruction and loss were mean-

¹ Some of the transports in the South African war carried 3,000 men each over ten times the distance which would have to be traversed by a French expedition to Ireland.

while effected. The calculation might also be that our preponderance at sea would not, in fact, be converted into overwhelming superiority—everything is doubtful in war until actual experiment is made—and then an expedition of this sort, properly aimed, might assist the enemy largely in the main contest itself. The Army at home, as wars may break out suddenly, must therefore always be prepared to meet raids of considerable magnitude, and not merely to defeat them in the end, but to make them so difficult that they will not even begin to succeed.

The *third* object for which an army is required is the garrisoning of the positions necessary to the Empire abroad, the garrisoning of places like Malta, Gibraltar, and Aden, necessary as fortified naval depôts and coaling stations, and the garrisoning of dependencies like India, Egypt, and South Africa both against internal tumults and raids from the outside. We are responsible for defending our Empire abroad as well as for home defence; and although we are here assisted by various local resources the organising of Imperial defence generally rests with the mother country, which must also very largely supply white troops from home, if it does not always pay for them. The remarks applicable to the possibility of a raid upon our home defences appear to be applicable here. Vital coaling stations may be assailed by small expeditionary forces landed for the purpose, as well as attacked by sea, with the additional temptation, hardly present in the case of an expedition to the United Kingdom itself, that the force may be able to get away safely after performing its work of destruction. The ambition of foreign Powers may fly at even higher game. If an expeditionary force, notwithstanding our preponderant Navy, may effect a landing by surprise in Ireland or even in Great Britain itself, a similar force apparently might be landed in Egypt or South Africa, or some other vulnerable part of our wide Empire, by a Power like France or Germany. The threat of a number of attempts may withdraw the fleet and ships we could oppose from the quarter where the real surprise may be tried. Curiously enough, history itself supplies the record of a landing by surprise on the part of the French in Egypt at a time when the English fleet was preponderant in the Mediterranean and when Nelson was on the look-out for the French expedition. What has happened before may happen again, and the change made since Nelson's time by the substitution of steamers for sailing ships appears all in favour of the possibility of surprise. A foreign surprise of this sort may appear even more tempting to an enemy than a raid upon Ireland or Great Britain. The temporary possession of Egypt by an enemy would upset all our arrangements for Imperial defence generally, and the calculation would be that much might happen before we were in a position to send another expedition to Egypt to restore our power. It was nearly two years after the

French landed in Egypt in 1799 before we were able to land a force to dispossess them. But whether in Egypt or elsewhere, our widely scattered Empire is clearly liable to surprise at some point, and the surprise may be serious if we have not at all necessary points suitable and adequate garrisons. The provision of such garrisons, then, is one of the main duties of an English army in time of peace.

I have spoken only of the possibility of raids by sea, as that is the main matter, having regard to the position of the great military Powers who may be our enemies. But of course there is a possibility of raids by land as well, as our Indian experience tells us. Happily, the enemies who may raid us by land at any point are mostly insignificant, but the possibilities are not to be altogether overlooked. They reinforce *pro tanto* the necessity for strong garrisons at all vulnerable points in time of peace.

The *fourth* object for which an army is required appears to be to repel a possible invasion at home—not a mere raid only, but a serious invasion. The opinion is sometimes expressed, and there is a great deal of force in it, that we have hardly to concern ourselves with a serious invasion, as the loss of command of the sea which would render invasion possible would mean our complete destruction as a Power, without the necessity of invasion at all. We should then be liable to blockade, and a strict blockade would mean our ruin. After much consideration, I have come to the conclusion that a condition of things might arise in which a strict blockade would not follow the defeat of our battle fleets at sea, and invasion might be resorted to instead by the successful enemy. The reason is that even after our battle fleets were defeated, supposing that to happen, the blockade of the English coasts by hostile fleets would be a tedious and difficult matter, requiring many ships of a miscellaneous character as well as battleships, which we could probably make a fight against, with our natural maritime superiority, for months and even years, until we were able to challenge once more the enemy's battleships. It might be the case of our fighting an Armada over again. But, while blockade would be difficult or impossible for an enemy, it is not inconceivable that if they had overcome our battle fleets they would be able to command the narrow seas sufficiently to convoy transports bringing enormous forces for the invasion of the country. We might thus be brought in contact on our own soil with the legions of continental Powers. What operations would be possible for an enemy in such circumstances need not be discussed in detail, but the possibility of even two or three hundred thousand men being thrown on our shores in a short time, and kept reinforced, appears not altogether outrageous in the conditions stated. If we are to recover, then, we must be able to defend our home citadel by land, pending the preparation of new fleets.

The *fifth* object we have to keep in view is the possibility of a

formidable attack on some part of our Empire by land, which we shall have to meet with large military force. We think of India mostly in such a connection, and of Russia as a possible assailant, as we must always remember that the India we are bound to defend practically includes Afghanistan, with which Russia in Central Asia is conterminous. But there are other possibilities also, of which the recent invasion of our territory in South Africa is an illustration. I cannot help thinking that we are less secure against land attack at other points than we are often assumed to be. When the Fashoda incident occurred, there was no little amusement at the talk in French newspapers of making a land attack on Egypt from Algeria. There was good cause for amusement, as no such attack could be improvised. But, great as the distance is from Algeria to Egypt, is it so certain that, in conditions which are not inconceivable, an attack of this sort, long foreseen and arranged, would be altogether without chances of success such as would encourage adventurous generals and officers? Another possibility is that Turkey in alliance with other Powers might attack Egypt from Asia Minor, as Egypt has so often been attacked in historical times, and our defence might not be so easy. These are only illustrations. An empire with land frontiers like those of the British Empire cannot but need land defence, and those who have charge of the military forces of the Crown must consider all the chances.

A *sixth* object was suggested by Mr. Brodrick in his speech on Army Reform. The Army, it is said, may have to take part in continental warfare by assisting an ally, in which case two or three army corps would be required for a respectable appearance on the scene. With combatants nearly balanced, a force of this sort thrown into the scale by England would possibly have the kind of effect which resulted from the appearance of English troops in the Peninsula in the great war with France; but the use of the English Army in this fashion would arise from diplomatic and military incidents of a peculiar kind, and does not appear a special object to provide for. As the greater includes the less, provision for the other objects stated will secure that we can participate, when required, in a European war.

Having stated the problem in this way, I come to the question of numbers—how many on a peace, how many on a war footing?

It will be obvious from the description above given of the objects of our Army that the peace footing should adequately provide for the first three of these objects, viz. defence against civil commotion; defence against raids by sea on the mother country at the outbreak of war and until our general naval preponderance is converted in fact into unquestioned and overwhelming superiority over the particular enemy engaged against us; and the similar defence of

our dependencies and coaling stations and dépôts abroad. The essence of security against civil commotion is the provision of a force adequate to prevent any riot becoming a rebellion; and the use of garrisons is to prevent surprise, so that they should be always ready. On the outbreak of war it will be too late to raise new levies and reinforce stations that are inadequately protected. The Army on a peace footing, then, must be equal to the duties described. In addition, the peace army must be a nucleus of force, and must contain an organisation enabling it to expand on a war footing for the other purposes contemplated—defence against possible invasion at home in contingencies that are not impossible, defence against serious invasion by land of any part of our extended Empire, and offensive action in certain contingencies against other Powers.

What force, then, is needed on a peace footing to meet these various objects?

I should say, to begin with, that about 30,000 men appear to be necessary, at least, for garrisoning our fortified dépôts and fortified commercial centres at home. Portsmouth, Plymouth, Chatham, the Thames, the Mersey, the Tyne, the Clyde, Queenstown, and other places must all have fortifications sufficient to protect them against stray cruisers, and even against stronger attempts by sea, which may become possible by the successful evasion of our fleets. How this can be done with less than 30,000 men, if it can be done with even that number, it is difficult to imagine. Fortifications swallow up men. The Garrison Artillery on the home establishment appears to amount to about 10,000 men, and with Engineers and other troops to supplement them a figure of 30,000 is very soon arrived at. These are all required, let it be repeated, on the peace establishment. Should war break out, the garrisons may perhaps be increased or set free for other work by mobilising Militia and Volunteers; but the brunt of the outbreak, the defence at the most critical moment, must be borne by the effective garrison actually in existence.

In addition, there should always be a field force at home of 80,000 trained soldiers at least, to guarantee civil order and to meet a descent upon Ireland or a large raid of that description. Half the 80,000, or nearly that number, will apparently be required in Ireland itself, about 30,000 to prevent the scandal that would be caused by any civil commotion, and the remainder being added to make sure that no expeditionary force can effect a successful landing. Many years ago, when I referred to the actual and indispensable garrison of Ireland as being about 30,000, military authorities challenged the statement, holding that although 30,000 soldiers were kept in Ireland, yet this was largely for reasons of convenience, and a garrison of 10,000, it was held, would suffice.

I ascertained, however, that in the opinion of the highest civil authorities in Ireland nothing less than 30,000 was considered sufficient, the object being not merely to hold the country with a firm military grip, but to prevent even the beginning of a rising. In putting down 40,000, therefore, as the needful force to be stationed in Ireland for all objects in time of peace, including the stoppage of raids at the outbreak of war, I believe I am not so wide of the mark.* The estimate, again, of other 40,000 troops at home, in addition to garrisons, does not seem extravagant. We must be ready in Great Britain against raids at the outbreak of war on at least as great a scale as we are ready in Ireland, and even the chances of civil commotion are not wholly to be overlooked.

Along with the garrisons of fortified places, therefore, we should on this estimate always require at home on a peace footing about 110,000 trained soldiers—30,000 for garrisons, and a field force of 80,000. If we had such a field force it is obvious that incidentally an emergency like the late South African war could be met. The field force could be sent away and reserves of some kind called out to take their place. But equally the force must be there on a peace footing before such a use could be found for it.

I have to call special attention to the phrase 'trained soldiers' which I have used. There is a great deal of confusion in these matters, from the way in which, for certain purposes, the numbers on the home establishment of the Regular Army are spoken of. These numbers, by the last estimate, are 155,000, which is 45,000 in excess of the number of trained soldiers required. Unfortunately the 155,000 comprise a vast number of raw recruits and immature youths who cannot be considered fit for service, to the number of perhaps 90,000 altogether. Deducting this 90,000 from the 155,000, we get no more than 65,000, in place of the 110,000 which is the minimum number we ought to have according to the above estimate. But this by the way. I am only calling attention for the moment to a cardinal ambiguity in the Army statistics which is apt to confuse the amateur when politicians are handling the figures, not for the purpose of enlightenment, but in order to throw dust in his eyes.

Next, what should be the peace footing of the Army outside the United Kingdom? Here again it must be remembered that, for the ordinary objects in view, peace footing and war footing are identical expressions, as at the outbreak of war there will be no time, and there may not be time for a certain period afterwards, to call out new forces and send them to the threatened points.

Answering this question, what we find is that, voluntarily or involuntarily, many parts of the Empire are capable of a great deal of

* See also the references in the debate on Mr. Brodrick's Resolutions to Mr. Childers's letters at the time of the Majuba business.

self-defence, and do in fact raise forces which can be useful not only on their own territories but elsewhere. Canada and Australia are especially useful in this respect; but there are local defence forces in some of our Crown Colonies as well, while even settlements like Hong Kong and Singapore provide in part for their own defence. The strength already added to the Empire in this way is enormous, and with proper organisation would be incalculable. It renders secure, with little or no Imperial effort, a great many commercial centres, depôts, and coaling stations throughout the Empire, and in a serious struggle, while we are preponderant at sea, gives us a large area from which to draw men and supplies. But the Imperial Government itself must contribute to the defence. The garrisons are a very serious matter. Apart from India, we maintain during peace about 55,000 troops in our dependencies, including the garrisons of Gibraltar, Malta, Hong Kong, Cape-town and Simon's Bay, &c., &c., and no one can say the numbers are too many. About 40,000 of these garrisons also are English soldiers, notwithstanding all that has been done to replace them in part by troops belonging to tropical races. In India we have or ought to have in normal times an English garrison of 70,000 men in addition to about 125,000 native troops: again another illustration of the local resources which the Empire can draw upon. Assuming for the present that the garrisons of such places as Gibraltar, Malta, Hong Kong, &c. &c., and of the great dependency of India, are generally sufficient on a peace footing—I should be very sorry to believe the contrary—yet there are one or two points in this business of garrisoning the Empire where the normal provision with which our rulers have hitherto been content is apparently inadequate. I would refer especially to South Africa and Egypt. In South Africa in 1899 we had no more than 15,000 troops, and according to the latest War Estimates this is apparently the normal garrison contemplated in future. I cannot help thinking, after the experiences we have had, that this is not business. No doubt South Africa is properly expected to provide largely for its own defence. Hence we are to have such forces as Baden-Powell's police. But a larger garrison of our own would appear to be necessary to make sure that we shall not have to fight another South African war. Instead of 15,000 we ought to have 50,000 men in South Africa for a few years at least, perhaps 100,000, mostly mounted men. There is the more reason for suggesting this as South Africa will obviously be an excellent training ground for the Army, giving plenty of room for manœuvres; while troops there, if they happen to be in excess, will be placed conveniently for transport to the East, or even home, if any emergency should arise. As regards Egypt, what I have said already will have indicated the nature of my apprehension. We have an English garrison in Egypt of 5,000 men only; and it may well be asked, What is this to meet a surprise and a raid by 20,000

men or more, which seems not altogether impossible? Of course there are native Egyptian forces, but precisely one of the dangers to be feared is the nerve of such troops when pitted against a European force, and possibly the existence of treachery at a critical moment. To those who urge the impossibility of even a surprise on Egypt while we are preponderant at sea, it may also be pointed out that the Suez Canal is theoretically neutralised, and foreign troops are continually passing through it; so that at the outbreak of war, in addition to the raiders by force, we might suddenly have upon our hands a few thousand enemy's troops passing through the Canal ostensibly on legitimate business, but suddenly diverted to an attack upon the English position in Egypt. Here, again, is a case for making sure. An addition of 15,000 men to the permanent garrison is apparently required.

Let us see, then, how we stand as regards our Army on a peace footing. The numbers required, exclusive of recruits and exclusive of the native troops used in India and elsewhere, appear to be as follows:

• Home—Garrisons of forts &c.	30,000
• " Field Army	80,000
• India	70,000
• Other garrisons abroad—actual	40,000
• Addition required in South Africa	35,000
• Addition required in Egypt	15,000
Total	270,000

To these numbers, moreover, must be added the number of recruits and young soldiers in training required to feed the effective army with drafts. These recruits and young soldiers are untrained or otherwise unfit for active service, but they have to be paid for from the time they enlist. The numbers required with our present system of recruiting must, however, be about 90,000,³ making the total numbers on our peace establishment 360,000. This is 90,000 more than are now provided for in the Estimates and on the Indian establishment; but can it be said that the proposed numbers are at any point excessive? Recollecting what happened in the United States for want of an army, and what happened to ourselves in South Africa two years ago, we can all see how much cheaper it is to maintain a proper force than to run any risks such as we are now doing. Whatever nice calculations we make, we should conform in this matter to the practice of engineers in estimating for works, and add a large percentage for under-estimates and the unforeseen.

We come then to the second question as regards the Army, viz. the numbers on a war footing. Here we have in view the last three

³ This was practically unquestioned in the recent debates on Mr. Brodrie's Resolutions.

objects above mentioned, as those for which an English army is maintained, viz. the provision against invasion at home on a large scale, or against a great war abroad on a land frontier, or in support of a European ally. Those who deny the possibility of an invasion of the mother country will at least admit the chance of more serious war elsewhere, so that the practical conclusion is very much the same. No doubt if we retain command of the sea we shall have some time after the outbreak of war to prepare forces for such eventualities, but we shall save much by having a good organisation meanwhile, and trained forces in reserve which can be called out in a short time—the quicker the better.

What I should like to see would be first of all a reserve of Regular trained soldiers equal in quality to the 270,000 trained soldiers, exclusive of recruits, who are to constitute, according to the above sketch, the peace army. The numbers of this reserve should also be considerable, at least equal, I should say, to the home field army *plus* half the force we maintain abroad—that is, to about 160,000 men in all. One half of these reserves would replace the field army at home when it was called away for foreign service, and the remainder would not be too many for drafts to maintain the fighting line for a certain time until recruits were sufficiently trained to come to the rescue. Here there is an enormous hiatus in our arrangements. In the current year's Estimates the reserve of the Regular Army appears as 90,000 only, which, according to the testimony of all experts, is far too small. The numbers in the first line, if serious war is contemplated, should be equalled by the numbers behind them who can be called on with certainty and without delay. How we are to get a reserve of trained soldiers may be even a more difficult question than how we are to get an army of trained soldiers on a peace footing to begin with; but we must of course state the problem if it is to be solved at all.

On a complete war footing we may want still larger numbers of Regular soldiers, although the numbers stated, it will be observed, would provide a considerable force either for defence against a great invasion at home or defence against invasion by one of our land frontiers. We should have 80,000 of the field army at home *in esse*, and to that might be added at once another 80,000 drawn from the reserve, still leaving a reserve of 80,000 men behind. An effective field army of 160,000 men with 80,000 behind, apart from recruits and volunteers, would be able to defend a line of over a hundred miles, and thus neutralise a very large invading force, which could only have a narrow space to deploy in, looking to the conditions of harbours which have to be secured as a base of operations. If employed abroad, in India for instance, the 160,000 would bring up the local army, exclusive of native troops, to 230,000, which would again be a considerable force, looking at the line or lines of attack

which must necessarily be followed by a land invader. Still we may want more numbers. We may be defeated at sea, and invasion thus rendered possible, while a large part of our field army is locked up in India or elsewhere. The training and discipline of forces beyond the numbers stated appear accordingly to be suggested. And such forces must either form part of the one Regular Army and be trained and disciplined as such, or must be auxiliary forces such as the Militia, Volunteers, and Yeomanry now are, not so fully trained as the Regular soldiers and only to be called out on emergency, but still sufficiently trained to form part of the fighting line.

What should be the numbers of such forces? On this head I should be disposed to accept the promise of Mr. Brodrick that he aims at about 150,000 of Militia and Militia Reserve, 250,000 Volunteers, and 50,000 Yeomanry, giving a force in all of 450,000, or say, making deductions for recruits and youths as in the case of Regulars, 350,000. This would give in all an army on full war strength, not including recruits or men unfit for service, as follows :

Regular Army, including garrisons	270,000
Regular Army Reserve	160,000
Auxiliary forces	350,000
Total	780,000

Deducting the garrisons at home and abroad the numbers would be 620,000, and would suffice, perhaps, to raise the army in the field for any specific purpose from the figure of 160,000 above stated to one of about 400,000, which the numbers in reserve would suffice to replenish for a considerable time.

Looking at the matter in detail we cannot say, I believe, that the figures stated for the Army on a peace and on a war footing are too high. The total of the Army on a full war footing is obviously somewhat speculative. As the contingency cannot occur without our having some time and warning to develop all the force required, the question has not perhaps the urgency of other Army questions ; but, with this exception, all the various questions are most urgent indeed, especially the question of the peace establishment of the Army. The work it may be called on to do is mostly of a kind that it has always to be ready for in peace, and the larger army which events may compel us to raise will only become a possibility if we have an effective Regular Army to begin with. The practical point to keep before the public is the need for numbers. Our forces all told, excluding colonial forces and the native armies of India and other possessions, must be over 600,000 on a full war footing ; and in time of peace we must not have fewer than 360,000 men, including about 90,000 recruits and young soldiers, under arms in the Regular Army including India, with

160,000 men of the Regular Reserve behind them, ready to be called on without delay.

As to the composition of the force, the proportions of the different arms, the organisation into army corps and otherwise, the provision of reserves of guns, ammunition, and equipment, these are all matters for experts where the public can hardly expect to follow. The experience of the late war showed that the man in the street was frequently sounder in his judgment even on technical matters than the War Office expert. He 'spotted' the necessity for more mounted men and for reserves of ammunition while the War Office remained densely ignorant. But it is none the less impossible for the outsider to follow the details of technical discussion. He may be right at one time and wrong at a dozen other times. On these points experts must be left to watch each other and the opinion of the Army itself is the only means to keep the authorities straight. When the War Office fails to command the assent of the Army on such points, there is sure to be something wrong.

Two points, however, remain on which public opinion has to form a judgment. How are the requisite numbers to be obtained? And what are the resources of the country to pay the bill?

As to the numbers of the Regular Army, I am sorry to say, from all the study I have been able to make of the subject, that all the discussions hitherto have been in the air, because the authorities will not face the dilemma in which they are placed—the one horn being that of paying the Army properly so as to ensure a supply of men, and the other that of conscription so as to obtain by force a service that is not given in sufficient abundance by those who are competent to perform it. This is the crux of the whole question of Army Reform. Men are wanted, and men are not got under present conditions and at the present rates of payment. As my military friends are never weary of repeating, the position is that the pay of the Army is quite insufficient to attract young men old enough and intelligent enough to go into the fighting line after a few months' training, and with constitutions sound enough to stand the wear and tear of service. Instead, we have lads who are many of them rather stupid, who take a year or two to train, and who take a year or two, perhaps two or three years, to grow old enough for the work. The result is a formidable wastage. One-third of the recruits, I am told, never become soldiers at all, but have to be discharged, and the time of drill-instructors and officers is wasted in trying to convert intractable material into fighting men. In such conditions it is a miracle that so much good material is obtained, but unfortunately there is not enough. The official establishments are not only fixed too low, but they are not maintained. As to the remedy, I have myself no doubt. We must, like other employers, pay the wages needed to attract the

service, if we can afford the money, as I have no doubt we can. What the addition to the Army pay should be is, of course, a difficulty. It would be folly to offer too much. It would be equal folly to offer too little and fail. But, as far as I can form an opinion, the sum to offer the private is an effective 2s. a day or thereabouts and all found, as compared with the present offer of 1s. a day subject to stoppages and without everything being found. Two shillings a day would come to about 40% a year; and everything found, including clothing, would add about 25% a year to the sum, thus bringing the soldier up to the level of the average wage receiver in the country, instead of leaving him far below it as he now is. Other ranks would, of course, have to be raised in proportion; and the officers also, especially as more is to be exacted from them in future, must have their pay increased. But whether the present suggestion is sufficient or not, there must be no hesitation in the matter. The question is one of terms, and we must bid as high as necessary for the article required if we adopt the alternative of paying for it instead of obtaining it by force.

As to the alternative of conscription or force, I have no objection to it in principle. We must have men for the service of the country, and force may have to be used in the last resort. What I doubt, however, is the economy of the proceeding. If we force people into the ranks of the Army who are able to earn outside the equivalent of 2s. a day with everything found and upwards, and we pay them substantially less, we may be quite sure of a discontent so great as to be intractable. It is not in human nature for large masses of people to submit to such odious exaction, and we cannot have the instrument of maintaining social order, on which the cohesion of society depends, in the hands of the discontented and mutinous. We save all such risks by having a volunteer army, and by raising the terms to the necessary amount. If there are practically no terms which will bring volunteers in the requisite number, then conscription there must be; but equally we must pay the conscript army the equivalent of the average wages they would receive outside.

Of course, so great an addition as that of 1s. a day to the pay of men in the Army, with other equivalent additions, would add greatly to the cost. On the present establishment of 155,000 men at home, and 55,000⁴ men in the colonies, whose cost is chargeable to the English Budget, the addition of 1s. a day per man would come to 3,832,000^{l.}, or say 4,000,000^{l.} per annum. If at the same time the numbers of the Army are considerably increased, we can perceive at once how formidable is the question of an increase of the pay of the Army to the English Treasury and to the House of Commons. All that

⁴ These include about 15,000 men of tropical races (see above); but this is a minor detail and may be passed over.

can be said is that the question, however disagreeable, must be faced. There is no use pretending to have an adequate Army if we shrink from the necessary outlay. In my own judgment, this shrinking would be most unworthy of a great nation and excessively foolish. The profit to be derived from an adequate Army, in the security of social order and freedom from international disturbance, is so overwhelmingly great that it is worth the price and more.

It would be a mistake, further, to suppose that there will be no compensating economies. On the contrary, we may set against the increase of pay the saving to be effected by a diminution of the number of boys and other incapables with whom the recruiting sergeant now fills the ranks. Suppose, instead of including on the home establishment 90,000, or about two years' recruits, we were able to reckon as immature and untrained only 40,000, we should save the whole cost of 50,000 men whom we now pay for and who are unfit for duty—a number almost as great as the addition proposed to be made to bring up the garrisons of Egypt and South Africa to the proper strength. In other ways the saving would also be considerable. We should have a larger army than we now have, and a good army all through, instead of an army spoilt by gross defects, and this of itself would facilitate other economies.

Regarding the auxiliary forces, there is not quite the same difficulty that there is with the Regular Army as to obtaining the numbers wanted. Very large numbers on paper are now obtained, probably sufficient for all practical purposes if a portion only can be trained so as to form an effective part of the fighting line, which it is the opinion apparently of the military authorities they can become. At the least, the training of the auxiliary forces advances the individuals so far that at need the Regular Army has a certain amount of raw material to draw upon which can be licked into shape more quickly than the ordinary recruits. One suggestion I have to make on this head would be that to a certain extent the Militia and Yeomanry as paid forces must be paid in proportion to the Regular Army according to the work they have to do, and this may be a serious matter if even a moderate standard of efficiency is insisted upon. The great danger of such auxiliary forces is that they may exist on paper only. Another suggestion is that conscription, while it may be found inapplicable to the Regular Army, may be used both to strengthen the auxiliary forces in numbers and to make them genuinely efficient. It is not unfair in the State to require that all young men as they come to the age of twenty-two should have qualified themselves to perform military service if they are medically fit, and that if found not so qualified they should be compelled to train in the Militia or Yeomanry for one or two years so as to become qualified. Such an obligation would stimulate volunteering or enlistment in the Militia or Yeomanry, while giving the military authorities a firmer hold

over the Volunteers by, their being able to define effectively the qualification to perform military service. It would certainly be of great advantage to the State to possess the large numbers of trained men which such regulations would give them, and to have Militia and Volunteers so far trained that the entire Regular Army and Reserves could be spared at need in some form or other for foreign service.

The conclusion, then, is that for the purpose of obtaining sufficient numbers the pay of the Regular Army must be sensibly increased, and that the pay of Militia and Yeomanry may also have to be increased in proportion; but that the numbers of the auxiliary forces generally may be increased by a modified form of compulsory service, to which I believe there could be no objection. The difficulty when faced is thus not a real one. It may be said, and many no doubt think, that it would be far simpler to have nothing but a Regular Army, and to leave the auxiliary forces out of the reckoning. The money spent on the latter, it is urged, would bring in a better return if it were used to make an addition to the Regular Army. But there is a great advantage; it seems to me, in having both a Regular Army, if it is sufficient for all the miscellaneous duties of the English Army in time of peace, and auxiliary forces along with it. We cannot tell how much the nation may be called on in great emergencies, and when these come we shall be all the better prepared if military training and skill in shooting are widely diffused among the population. It will be an advantage to the State also to have the whole population thus educated in the elementary duties of citizenship and the meaning of Imperial privileges and burdens.

There remains the question of ways and means. Already we have Army Estimates of 30,000,000*l.* per annum, apart from the South African war, as compared with 20,000,000*l.* two or three years ago. If the pay of the Regular Army is increased as proposed, this will add directly about 4,000,000*l.* to the Estimates, and a further large sum will be required on the score of additions to the numbers of the Regular Army, about 50,000 net as compared with present establishments, allowing for the substitution of effective men for ineffectives. This would cost another 5,000,000*l.* or thereabouts. Other outlays are also in view, such as the provision of improved barrack accommodation, the increase of reserves of ammunition and equipment, the multiplication of officers so as to secure the training of reserves and auxiliary forces, the increase of the proportion of mounted men in the Service, the increase of artillery, and so on. It is quite certain, practically, that with all the economy possible we shall have Army Estimates of 40,000,000*l.* and upwards in peace times before very long. We were living in a fool's paradise before the South African war, and are now awaking to

the realities of life. I would point out, however, that, although the figures sound large, people forget how large has been the increase of wealth in the country for many years past.^o With Army Estimates of 40,000,000*l.* and Navy Estimates of equal amount, we shall be paying no more in proportion than other countries do, and less than we have paid in former times, and less than we have paid even in this South African war for a couple of years when money has been made to flow like water and numberless lives have been lost, all because we were so unprepared. The country can well afford to meet such outlays, and the sacrifice should be willingly made.

I have written at greater length than I intended when I began, but perhaps a summary of a few principal points may be allowed, so as to familiarise the reader with the essential ideas, in my judgment, which should be kept in mind in these discussions :

(1) The Regular Army is required primarily, as all other armies are required, for the maintenance of internal order ; and for this reason alone—that is, to garrison Ireland and to keep order in Great Britain—a considerable force must be kept.

(2) The Regular Army is required, further, for defence of fortified ports and centres at home, and for the defence of the whole country against raids by foreign Powers either at the outbreak of war or in the interval which must elapse before our general preponderance at sea is converted into overwhelming superiority in fact over the particular enemy engaged.

(3) For these two purposes alone we appear to require about 110,000 trained soldiers altogether, exclusive of recruits and immature men, viz. 30,000 for garrisons and 80,000 as a mobile force.

(4) There is much confusion in these matters, from the War Office habit of counting recruits and immature men as part of the home establishment ; so that with the present establishment of 155,000 there are not in fact more than 65,000 trained and mature men, instead of the 110,000 actually required both for garrisons and field force. The three army corps of 120,000 Regulars supposed to be ready for foreign service according to Mr. Brodrick's scheme cannot in fact exist, because there are only 65,000 available for all purposes, including garrisons ; and deducting 30,000 for garrisons, there are only 35,000 available instead of 120,000.

(5) The Regular Army is further required for garrisoning India, South Africa, Egypt, Malta, Gibraltar, and other possessions and fortified places abroad, and it appears on this head that considerable additions ought to be made, both South Africa and Egypt in particular being insufficiently provided for. The numbers we require in all for these garrisons appear to be 160,000, instead of 110,000 as stated in the Army Estimates. It seems unnecessary to labour this point while about 140,000 of the Regular Army, besides irregular forces,

are in South Africa alone, engaged in garrisoning the country, and not in actual war. We must make up our minds to have larger figures to deal with for garrisoning the Empire than the Government put forward as their peace estimate.

(6) Altogether, including the Indian force, we require a Regular Army of 270,000 men, besides 90,000 recruits and immature men on the present system of recruiting, or a total of 360,000 in all.

(7) In addition, we require about 160,000 reserves for the Regular Army, besides help from the auxiliary forces, so as to provide for the possibility of serious invasion by sea when invasion, though not strict blockade, may be possible to a momentarily superior enemy, and so as to provide also for serious wars abroad.

(8) To get the numbers required an increase of pay for the Regular Army is absolutely necessary; and the increased pay, coupled with the necessary additions to the trained men in the Army, after allowing for the substitution of effectives for ineffectives by means of higher pay, would probably add about 10,000,000*l.* to the existing peace Estimates of 30,000,000*l.*, making 40,000,000*l.* in all.

(9) We must remember, however, that there has been an enormous increase of wealth in the country for many years past, and that we are only awaking to the realities of existence as far as military and naval preparation is concerned. Even if we had to pay 40,000,000*l.* apiece for Army and Navy we should still be less burdened than other nations and should not be paying more than we can well afford.

(10) Conscription appears to be unnecessary for the Regular Army, as to which we must trust to higher pay, but it may be useful in connection with the auxiliary forces, qualification for military service being required from all young men on reaching a certain age, failing which they must be enrolled in the Militia. It is desirable, for many reasons, that military training should be widely diffused.

(11) Organisation is specially for the military experts, but nothing can be done without numbers, and the numbers I have stated are the minimum of what is now required, looking to all our commitments in India, South Africa, Egypt, and elsewhere, and on the assumption, which is a matter to be seen to, that our Navy is really preponderant.

THE QUEEN VICTORIA MEMORIAL HALL IN INDIA

!

By the courtesy of the Editor of this Review, I am enabled to bespeak the attention of those friends of India at home who are likely to be interested in it, to the scheme which has been started in India for commemorating her late Majesty Queen Victoria, by the erection of a Memorial Hall in Calcutta, the capital of the Indian Empire.

It is intended that this hall, the central feature of which will be a representation of the late Queen, together with such memorials of her personality and reign (in connection more particularly with India) as we are able to procure, shall also serve as a National Gallery, or Hall of Fame, in which will be collected and displayed the memorials and relics of the great men, both European and Indian, who have served this country, and of the great events which have marked its history.

When the late Queen died, there was a wonderful and striking outburst of sorrow from the whole of India. All classes of the native population, from the Princes to the humblest cultivator, joined in this manifestation; and a desire was at once evinced to give expression to this unanimity of feeling by the creation of a memorial, or memorials, to the deceased Sovereign. It fell to me to take the initial steps for inaugurating an all-Indian fund for this purpose, which, without interfering at all with the formation of provincial or local funds, wherever local feeling preferred such an outlet, as in many cases it has done, should yet condense, in a single and striking form, the sentiments of the entire continent.

A scheme which had been for long in my mind, as a possible memorial of the life and reign of Queen Victoria, was accepted as an appropriate method of giving form to the feelings universally aroused by her death, and of perpetuating her name in India; and the plan of the proposed Victoria Memorial Hall was explained to crowded meetings in Calcutta, and was widely discussed by the Press throughout the country. Differing opinions were entertained, as was only natural, in different quarters as to the character and the site of the

proposed Memorial: but its general acceptability may be inferred from the fact that, within a period of two and a half months, a sum of nearly 210,000*l.* has been subscribed on its behalf from all parts of India (assuming a limit of one lakh of rupees to be placed upon the too generous offers of certain of the princes); and this is likely to be very materially augmented when the contributions from the provinces come in. The practical realisation of the scheme may therefore be regarded as assured; although, if it is to be executed on an adequate scale, I do not think that 300,000*l.* will be too small a sum, and although I shall hope to make substantial progress in the direction of such a total. During the period in which plans and designs are being made, and the building erected, I shall also hope, by assiduous research and by appeals to those who are capable of rendering assistance, to lay the foundations of the collection which will, later on, be enshrined within its walls.

A few words may, perhaps, be said as to the suitability of the selected site. The imagination of a good many persons has been not unnaturally affected by the imperial associations of Delhi, the central position and the dry air of which have been cited as additional reasons in favour of its selection as the site of the proposed Memorial. The argument has also been employed that the spot at which the Queen assumed the direct administration of India, and where the Proclamation of 1858 was given forth, should be the scene of her monument. But this plea is based upon historical ignorance; for the Proclamation was made, not at Delhi, but at Allahabad. The only imperial function with which Her Majesty's name was connected that has taken place at Delhi was the proclamation of her title as Empress of India, by Lord Lytton on the 1st of January 1877. Delhi was selected for this purpose, both on sentimental grounds, because of its old fame as the capital of the Mogul, and for practical reasons, because of its suitability for the formation of a vast camp and the massing of a large body of troops. It would probably be selected again for any similar function.

The connection, therefore, of Delhi with the Queen is, but for this incident, no greater than that of any other Indian city. Indeed, to most Englishmen it is better known for its historic siege during the Mutiny than for any other associations. The reasons, however, for not placing the proposed memorial at Delhi will be, to those who understand the conditions of official life in India, very patent. Delhi is not the capital of the Government of India. However desirable it might have been at an earlier date to select it for that purpose, the erection of a great series of Government buildings at Calcutta, its utilisation as the headquarters of Government for a period of 150 years, and the metropolitan character which it has thus acquired, and which is reflected in the numbers of its population (now 1,121,000

as compared with 208,000 at Delhi), its appearance, and its life, render it practically certain that nothing short of some tremendous convulsion of Nature, reducing the city to ruin, will drive the Government of India elsewhere, during the five winter months of the year that are spent in the plains. Delhi's chances of supplanting Calcutta may therefore be considered infinitesimal. Neither is Delhi the capital of a Local Government. It is merely the residence of a Commissioner, and of a very small civil and military population. However much a memorial erected there might be visited and seen by travellers from all parts of India, it is not possible that it could be erected under adequate supervision; it is still less possible that the collections which it is to contain should be accumulated, or added to, at a place where the controlling authorities, of whom the Viceroy must always be the chief, are never found. It is as though a London committee, under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister, were invited to undertake the erection and maintenance of a great fabric, and the installation within it of a valuable collection, at Gibraltar or at Malta. It will need the most untiring activity on the part of the Viceroy to carry the plans into execution at Calcutta, where he is present for four months only in each year. It would be absolutely out of the question at Delhi, which he visits for two days once in five years.

Calcutta being chosen for the site, it will, of course, be necessary to employ such materials as will best resist the ravages of a tropical climate, and to adopt such precautions as are necessary for the protection of the contents. The building will probably be faced entirely with white marble, of which there are many excellent varieties in India. Its contents should not be any more difficult of preservation than those of Wellesley's Government House, which have remained intact for a hundred years.

In one respect Calcutta offers advantages with which no other city in India can compete. It possesses in the Maidan one of the finest city parks to be seen in any capital in the world. Situated on the outskirts of the town, and yet in close proximity to its most crowded quarters, this great expanse, already adorned with the statues of Governors-General and eminent men, presenting a stretch of green sward such as can nowhere be created in the drier climate of Northern India, interspersed with avenues and clumps of trees, and lending itself both to landscape gardening and to architectural effect, offers an almost ideal site for the erection of a simple but noble memorial structure.

It has not yet been finally determined upon what portion of the Maidan the Victoria Hall will be placed. The architect, when appointed, must be consulted upon this point. It is proposed to surround the Hall by a beautiful public garden, the laying out of which will be co-ordinated with the design and plan of the building.

Having thus explained the choice of locality and the selection of site, I pass to a description of the character and contents of the proposed Memorial Hall.

It has been hinted in some quarters that any separation of these from the personality of the late Queen will by so much detract from the personal character of the memorial. There is some, but not I think considerable, force in this criticism. A monument that was purely personal in character, such as the Albert Memorial in London, or the Scott Memorial in Edinburgh, might not have attracted all the contributions that we have received. A bronze out-of-door statue of Her Majesty for Calcutta, subscribed for at the time of her second Jubilee, has already been completed, and is now on exhibition in England. Its erection on the Maidan, with surroundings of suitable dignity and splendour, will be made a first charge upon the funds that we are now collecting. But it will exhaust no more than a small fraction of them. Further, we do not possess in India the artists to erect an English Taj. The best of our English sculptors will probably be employed upon the Queen's Memorial in London, and we could not have hoped in India to carry into execution any great work of a purely monumental character.

Nevertheless the Queen will be the central figure of the Hall that bears her name. Under a central dome, or in a central hall, will stand in all probability her effigy. Upon its marble walls will be inscribed in letters of gold, in English and in the vernaculars, the terms of her celebrated Proclamation, and of her various messages to the Indian people. Around, in cases, will be displayed objects directly connected with herself; her autograph letters, and such memorials of herself as we are fortunate enough to secure.

Around this centre, or branching from it, will be a series of galleries and corridors and halls, which bring me to the secondary aspect of the scheme as a National Gallery, or Hall of Fame, for India. There can be no doubt that the addition to it of this feature, at once sentimental and utilitarian, æsthetic and practical, has stimulated the liberality of the response which has been evoked in this country. There is no country where there exists such a lamentable and appalling dearth of material for bringing the past in a visible form before the eyes of the present, for teaching the lessons of history in a concrete form, or for familiarising succeeding generations with the commanding figures and the memorable events that have preceded them. Other countries have their National Galleries or Imperial Museums. England has the National Gallery, the National Portrait Gallery, the British Museum, the Tate Gallery, Greenwich Hospital, the Tower of London, the Royal United Service Institution, not to speak of the monuments in Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's. In all of these are preserved the memorials of great

men, of dramatic incidents, and of momentous times. Paris has the Louvre, the Luxembourg, and a great number of smaller galleries and collections. Berlin is particularly rich, apart from its Picture Gallery, in the possession of the Arsenal, which contains a most interesting collection of military paintings and trophies, and; the Hohenzollern Museum. In India we have nothing of the sort. No period in the history of India has been more remarkable for triumphs, both of war and peace, than the reign of the late Queen. None has been more crowded with stirring episodes, or with the deeds of famous soldiers, scholars, writers, and statesmen, and yet, beyond a few scattered statues and busts, ill seen and oft unknown, we have no visible memorials of this crowded and illustrious past. A traveller might come to India and leave it with the impression that, since the days of the great Moguls, whose tombs and temples are the wonder of the East, it had had no history that was worthy of concrete commemoration, had produced or seen no great figures, but had only been fortunate in the enjoyment of an administration which had been lavish in endowing it with law courts, town halls, educational institutions, secretariats, and gaols. It is still not too late, though before long it may be so, to supply this need; and to provide India with that which every civilised nation should possess, for bringing home to the popular imagination the reality of the past, and for implanting in future generations the instincts of national pride, of reverence, and of patriotism.

The desirability being thus accepted of making the commemoration of Her Majesty the central feature of a building which should also commemorate those who have served her in India, and the events of the past, the question arose as to what limitations of nationality, character, or period should be applied. It was obviously impossible to appeal to the Indian Princes and people for a memorial that would be exclusively devoted to the glorification of Englishmen. For such an appeal would have implied that there was nothing remarkable or memorable in India that had not been done by Englishmen—an implication that would have been both insulting and historically unjust. It was also impossible to limit the collection to the personalities or the episodes of Her Majesty's reign. A single illustration will suffice. Would the Duke of Wellington be admitted? He lived for fourteen years into the Queen's reign. But his Indian career was over more than thirty years before it began, and fourteen years before Queen Victoria was born. And if the memorials of the Duke of Wellington were admitted, how could we exclude those of the brother under whom he served, of Lord Cornwallis, who both preceded and succeeded that brother, and of the greatest of all the proconsuls of that epoch, Warren Hastings? To start a National Gallery, and at the same time to institute an arbitrary limitation in respect of

time, would be to deprive it both of the representative and of the educational character with which it is imperative that it should be endowed.

Similar considerations were held to apply to Indian history and to Indian names. Since the entire country has passed under the settled dominion of the British, less scope is afforded for those careers of prominence or adventure which were possible and frequent in times when war was as a rule proceeding in some part of the peninsula, when the country was split up into innumerable small units, and when, as the authority of the Mogul Emperor waned, any bold spirit might hope to carve a road to a kingdom or to fame. The history of the British rule in India is bound up with so many of these names that to exclude their memorials, where they are available, would be to give a one-sided view of history. If we trace back the records of British connection with India, we of course come ultimately to a stop at the point where that history commenced at the dawn of the seventeenth century. Following the same process with native history, we arrive at no fixed or natural starting-point until the foundation of the Mogul dynasty, by Baber, seventy years earlier. This, then, is the limit that has been tentatively accepted in respect of Indian history. We shall probably not secure many memorials of the age from Baber to Aurungzeb. Did we attempt to recede further into the past, we should run the risk, which I desire especially to avoid, of confusing the purpose of the Victoria Hall with that of an archæological museum, and of usurping the functions which, in India as elsewhere, the numerous specimens of the latter class are designed to fulfil.

In this paper, which is written for English readers in England, it is not necessary for me to say anything about the persons or events in native Indian history with whose commemoration we shall charge ourselves. Our success, or failure, in doing so will depend upon efforts which will be confined to this country, and upon the response that our appeals will elicit from Indian princes, antiquarians, and wealthy men. An English audience may take a more direct, and as I hope a sympathetic, interest in that part of the scheme which will relate to the perpetuation of the services and names of eminent Englishmen (of course I do not mean to exclude Scotchmen, Irishmen, &c.), and I will accordingly describe the methods by which it is proposed to accomplish this end.

The collection in the Victoria Hall will fall more or less into the following categories :

(1) A gallery of sculpture, in which will be collected the statues, busts, and medallions of distinguished men. We fortunately already possess the nucleus of such a collection in Calcutta, though the objects are so widely scattered, and so inadequately placed, that

their existence is probably quite unknown to travellers, and is but little known to the majority of Calcutta residents. There is a very fine marble statue of Warren Hastings by Westmacott, which is now effectually concealed from public view in an unused portico of the Town Hall. In the ground floor of the same building, which is rarely used for public purposes, is a colossal figure of Cornwallis by Bacon. There are busts of James Prinsep and the Duke of Wellington in the same building, which has been condemned as unsound, and will probably one day be pulled down. In the Dalhousie Institute, which was named after the great Governor-General, and was intended to be a sort of Valhalla for Calcutta, but is now merely an entertainment room, with a small club attached to it, are a number of fine pieces of statuary. A beautiful marble effigy of Lord Hastings by Chantrey stands in the portico. Inside are statues or busts of Dalhousie (which belonged originally to Government House), Havelock, Outram, Nicholson. A number of others that I might name are distributed elsewhere. We shall offer to all these scattered objects a more worthy setting in the Victoria Hall.

(2) A gallery or galleries of paintings, engravings, prints, and pictorial representations in general, both of persons and scenes. Here, again, we already possess in Calcutta the germs of such a collection, and since the scheme was started, I have received offers or promises of others. Where their owners do not care to part with them altogether, we may hope to obtain specimens on loan. Oil painting is now almost extinct in India. But a century ago, a number of English artists of repute, including more than one Royal Academician, came out from England and spent some time in the country, undertaking commissions on a large scale. Several of their pictures are still traceable. One of the objects of this article is to discover still more. At about the same time a series of admirable coloured engravings by English artists were published of Indian places and scenes. These also we shall collect, and where we cannot secure originals, shall be content with reproductions.

It ought to be possible after diligent search to present in mezzotint and line engravings an almost continuous history of Anglo-Indian worthies, battles, sieges, landscapes, buildings, forts, and scenes during the last two hundred years.

(3) In view of the great munificence that has been shown by the Native Chiefs in contributing to this Hall, which but for their princely donations would never come into being, I should like to create a Court, or Hall, of Princes within it, where such memorials might be collected as they were willing to offer or to lend. Statues and likenesses of notable men among them might be placed here, and might appropriately be surrounded by a collection of the arms and accoutrements—spears and battle-axes, swords, shields, horse

trappings, and coats of mail—that were once the everyday furniture of their glittering courts, and many of which still survive.

(4) It should be even easier to amass a first-rate collection, in a gallery set apart for the purpose, which would furnish a complete chronological illustration of the history of British arms in India. Specimens of the various uniforms that have been worn both by the British and the native soldiers, first of the Company and afterwards of the Crown, and of the weapons that they have carried, will be here displayed. Military trophies, now locked up in unvisited arsenals, can be brought out into the daylight. In the same gallery might be placed a collection of British medals given for service in India and upon its borders.

(5) The documentary illustration of historical events will form an important feature. In cases or stands we shall collect and exhibit the originals, or where these are not procurable, copies of treaties, sanads, patents, and charters, despatches from the Government of India with the signatures of successive Governors-General and their colleagues, and other documents or manuscripts of personal or historical interest. Maps and plans will form a subsidiary but very necessary feature of the same collection. Seals, newspapers, coins, stamps are all the raw materials from which history is composed, and in time these too may be forthcoming.

(6) Another very proper content of the Hall will be a collection of models. There are many objects of great historical interest which we either cannot procure, because they have vanished, or could not admit, because of their size and unsuitability, but which might very fitly be represented by small-scale reproductions. I allude to such instances as ships, from the pioneer sloops of the merchant adventurers to the four-masted sailing ships that still lift their spars against the sunset on the Hugli; forts, sieges, and battlefields; structures and buildings.

(7) We shall endeavour to enhance the personal note which is the source of so much interest in any collection, by placing in stands or cases in the various galleries the relics and trophies, the correspondence and handwriting, miniatures, articles of costume or use—in a word, the personal belongings of those who are held worthy of inclusion.

(8) Finally, we shall hope to decorate the walls of some of the galleries and corridors by fresco paintings of famous events in Indian history. The art of such painting in a manner that is absolutely durable is not yet extinct in India: and even if we are unable ourselves to supply the designs, I think that we can undertake to produce the artificers. Perhaps in other parts of the building we shall resort to the representation of acts or scenes through the medium of bronze or copper plaques affixed to the walls.

In a speech which I made at Calcutta explanatory of the scheme, I gave a rough classification of the characters and personalities whom we should like to commemorate, and of whom we should endeavour to procure memorials for the Victoria Hall. I may repeat it here with the premise that it makes no pretence to being exhaustive. It may, however, be useful as an indication of the lines upon which we shall hope to proceed. Later on, a committee of management or board of trustees, with the Viceroy as *ex-officio* chairman, will probably be constituted, to whom, as in the case of the National Gallery or British Museum, all offers will be referred. In the meantime, even while the hall is in course of being planned and raised, I am anxious to proceed at once with the formation of the collection: since I should like it to be ready for removal to its ultimate destination as soon as the latter is ready to receive it. I have arranged that any objects which we thus acquire shall be kept on temporary exhibit in the Museum at Calcutta, where one or more galleries can be placed at their disposal.

The types whom we desire to commemorate are the following:

Pioneers of commerce and empire, such as Sir T. Roe, Job Charnock, Sir Josiah Child; Governors, Governors-General, and Viceroys, from Governor Holwell and Lord Clive to modern times; famous personages, such as Sir Philip Francis and Sir Elijah Impey; distinguished Governors or Lieutenant-Governors or Administrators of the provinces, such as Thomas Pitt, the grandfather of Lord Chatham, Sir Thomas Munro, and Streynsham Master from Madras; Sir John Malcolm, Mountstuart Elphinstone, Sir Bartle Frere from Bombay; Lord Metcalfe, Sir Henry Lawrence, James Thomason, Sir Ashley Eden, Sir Henry Ramsay from other provinces. There will be a category of great generals and soldiers, such as Sir Eyre Coote, Sir Arthur Wellesley (Duke of Wellington), Lord Lake, Lord Harris, Lord Keane, Sir David Ochterlony, Sir Charles Napier, Sir James Outram, Lord Gough, Sir Henry Havelock, Sir Colin Campbell (Lord Clyde), Sir Hugh Rose (Lord Strathnairn), Lord Napier of Magdala. There will be frontier heroes, such as Sir Herbert Edwards, Colonel James Skinner, Colonel John Jacob, and General John Nicholson; military adventurers, such as the famous George Thomas, who rose from being a sailor and a cavalry leader to be Raja of Hansi, and the cluster of foreigners who entered the service of Mysore, the Mahratta chiefs, and Runjit Singh. There will be men of letters and science; historians, such as Orme, Tod, Sleeman, Elliott, James Mill, Lord Macaulay, Sir John Kaye, Sir William Hunter; students or scholars or antiquarians, such as Sir William Jones, James Rennell, H. H. Wilson, H. T. Colebrook, James Prinsep, Sir Alexander Cunningham, Professor Max Müller, Professor Monier Williams, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Sir Henry Yule; financiers, such as James

Wilson; jurists, such as Sir Henry Maine and Sir James Stephen; explorers and pioneers, such as Captain John Wood, Alexander Burnes, Moorcroft, Hayward; reformers and philanthropists, churchmen, and missionaries, such as Marshman, Carey, David Hare, Dr. Duff; Bishops Heber and Cotton. I have not included in this list the name of any living person, although there are several whom public opinion will rightly hold to be worthy of commemoration.

Such in rough outline is the plan of the projected Victoria Hall. How far we shall succeed in realising it will depend even more upon the attitude of others than upon the activity which we are ready to apply ourselves. The committee of the fund in India are now engaged in bringing out a journal, which will appear at intervals, and will record the progress of the scheme, and the accumulation of the collection.

We propose to place this journal free of charge in the hands of any friend who is interested in the work. Its circulation may bring us in useful advice or offers, while the record of these will supply a basis for the future catalogue of the exhibition. A committee of distinguished Englishmen, who have served in, or been connected with, India, is also in course of formation, to help and to advise us at home. The memorials and relics that we hope to acquire by gift, by bequest, by purchase, by loan, but most of all by the first of these means, are scattered far and wide in many a private collection, in many an unknown quarter. Here in India we have not the opportunity or the knowledge thoroughly to search them out. As it is, the execution of the project, on however modest a scale, will for several years throw upon us at this distance an enormous burden of research, correspondence, and anxiety. We have not in India the learned societies, the trained experts, the wealthy collectors, the art connoisseurs, or even the personal leisure that are forthcoming in Europe. The British officers of Government are a fleeting body, and many of them are in constant movement about a continent that is as large as Europe without Russia. The daily business of Government imposes a strain that admits of little interlude or relaxation. We cannot, when we are elsewhere, run up to Calcutta by train in a few hours, as a man can do to London from almost any part of the United Kingdom. It is impossible to convene committee meetings from the four corners of so vast a continent. Even a letter to England—and we shall have to write many—will not bring a reply for five or six weeks. All these are the inevitable restrictions under which we in India shall be obliged to work. I feel, therefore, that I may, with reason and without offence, appeal to that portion of the British public which is interested in India, or has itself borne a share in its history, to assist me in this onerous task. It must be an object of desire to every Englishman that the Indian Memorial to the great and good

Sovereign whom we have lately lost should be executed on a scale and in a manner worthy of her august name; and this desire will not be diminished by the consciousness that in this wonderful portion of her dominions, the core and crown of empire, the Memorial to be erected will also be one that will teach to English and to Indians alike the inspiring lessons of national pride and Imperial unity.

CURZON.

Viceroyal Lodge, Simla: April 24, 1901.

THE RELIGION OF THE BOERS

THE original Boer settlers of 1654, and the French Protestants who emigrated to South Africa in 1688 after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, were alike Calvinists of a specially rigid type. Exile under the stress of the Dragonnades made the French settlers ready to merge their nationality with that of the people who sheltered and protected them, and, although they made at first a feeble struggle to retain their language in the services of religion, by the year 1700 they were content to allow themselves to be absorbed absolutely by the organisation of Dutch Reformed Calvinism, and to surrender the use of their language in public worship. The difference of language counted little when the agreement in religious belief was so thorough and complete. The liberal Protestants of Holland who followed Arminius were utterly crushed by the decrees of the Synod of Dort in 1619, which taught the same doctrines as the French Calvinist 'Confession' of 1559. The Calvinists gained a complete victory, and the standards of the established religion of Holland were henceforward absolutely Calvinistic. The Decrees of the Synod of Dort, the Belgic Confession, and the Heidelberg Catechism formed the official standards of religion which the Dutch settlers brought with them to South Africa. The French emigrants on their arrival clung as closely to them as the Dutch themselves did, and the French blend, as years passed on, lent a certain logical precision and hardness bordering on fanaticism to South African Calvinism. The French emigrants rapidly came to the front, and their present-day descendants have become, with a few notable exceptions, the leading men amongst the Boers of the Cape Colony and the former Republics. The names of De Villiers Joubert, De la Rey, Olivier, Malan and Fouché are well enough known, and if a list of the South African Dutch Reformed ministers of the present day were scanned, it would be found that a large proportion of them bore French names.

Religious intolerance was a note of the seventeenth century in England and elsewhere. The Boers and Huguenots brought their seventeenth-century ideas with them to South Africa, and they have

only recently been modified by the pressure of events. In 1714 there were a good many German Lutherans at the Cape. They petitioned for years in vain for liberty of worship. It was tardily granted them in 1771, and in 1778 the Lutherans were allowed to build a church in Capetown. But no Lutheran was allowed to hold any office under Government and the Lutheran minister was forbidden, under the penalty of a heavy fine, to baptize any child born of Dutch Calvinist parents.

We cannot, of course, forget that religious toleration was granted by slow degrees in England. But the people of England never treated foreign Protestants in the same harsh way as the Dutch Calvinists did the Lutherans and Moravians at the Cape.

The Boer native policy, which I dealt with in a former article in this Review, had Calvinism for its basis, and was deeply rooted in the early days of the colony. The black man was born under the curse of Ham, and his function was to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water for the elect people of God. Therefore to attempt to make a Christian of him was an impious effort to reverse the Almighty decree whereby he was irrevocably predestined to perdition.

The Dutch authorities at the Cape resolutely carried out this policy in the case of George Schmidt, the first Moravian missionary to South Africa. He landed in 1737 and settled at Genadendal, which is now the historic centre of Moravian missions in South Africa. He gathered round him a handful of Hottentots, and by diligent and kindly methods he civilised and Christianised a few of them. But the Moravians are not Calvinists, and directly his work began to show signs of progress he was turned out of South Africa. From 1743, the date of George Schmidt's expulsion, to 1792, when toleration was somewhat tardily conceded to the Moravian missionaries, all missionary work amongst the natives was stopped. When the Moravians returned to the scene of Schmidt's labours after the lapse of over fifty years, they found a trace of his work in the person of an aged Hottentot woman, who still treasured a New Testament he had given her. The book is now kept in a box made from a pear-tree planted by Schmidt, and is carefully preserved by the missionaries at Genadendal.

It will be remembered that, after the first capture of the Cape in 1795, the colony was restored to the Batavian Republic at the Peace of Amiens. The Batavian Republic was the result of the action of the French Revolution upon Holland. The House of Orange was in exile, and French revolutionary ideas permeated the country. The Cape was then administered by Commissary De Mist, a Hollander of progressive and liberal views. But he did not attempt to run counter to the religious prejudices of the South African Boers. He promulgated an ordinance on the 15th of February, 1805, ordering that 'no missionary of any society

be allowed to labour within the limits of the colony.' A few years previously the London Missionary Society, which was mainly supported by the Independents or Congregationalists, sent out the missionaries Van der Kemp and Read to work in South Africa. It is evident that these missionaries were out of touch with the Dutch Calvinist native policy, for when they appealed to the Dutch Reformed Consistory at Capetown for leave to minister to the heathen at the capital, since their other work was stopped, they were met by an unsympathetic resolution dated the 17th of December, 1805, referring them to the terms of De Mist's proclamation, which the Dutch ministers evidently thought quite fair and reasonable. Van der Kemp and Read appeared in person before the Consistory, and pleaded their cause in vain, and the Consistory minute on the subject ends with the terse statement that 'all further intercourse with them was broken off.' They then decided to shake the dust of South Africa from their feet, and go as missionaries to Madagascar.

But before they could sail a notable event occurred. England determined to hold the Cape again, as the Peace of Amiens had been broken by France in 1803, and there was danger of a French occupation of Capetown. Sir David Baird, with a fleet of sixty-three men-of-war and transports, was sent to recapture the Cape, and, after defeating Général Janssens and his French allies at the battle of Blaauwberg, Capetown was once more surrendered, and the British flag again flew over the old Castle on the 10th of January, 1806. The pious scholar and divine, Henry Martyn, was present as chaplain to the East India Company, and he landed after the battle to minister to the wounded and dying. He records in his diary that when he saw the British flag run up at the Castle: 'I prayed that the capture of the Cape might be ordered to the advancement of Christ's kingdom, and that England might not remain proud and ungodly at home, but might show herself great indeed by sending forth the ministers of her Church to diffuse the gospel of peace.' South Africa sorely needs the fulfilment of this good man's prayer to-day, and if the English Church does not respond to her duty in healing the wounds which war has made, our people will be held unworthy to hold and keep South Africa. The enormous difficulties that lie before the English Church in South Africa at the present time should not deter churchmen from doing their duty. The greatest of all difficulties lies in the tone and temper of the Dutch Reformed Calvinists, and their lost ideals, whose story I must at this point resume. The terms of the Capitulation, in its 8th Article, secured that 'the burghers and inhabitants shall preserve all their rights and privileges which they have enjoyed hitherto; public worship, as at present in use, shall also be maintained without alteration.' This secured all the legal rights of the Dutch Reformed Consistories and ministers, and the

British Government henceforward paid the stipends of the Dutch Reformed clergy out of public funds. Sir David Baird was himself a Scotch Presbyterian, and thus in sympathy with the established religion of the Dutch colonists. He expelled from the colony the only Roman Catholic priest who had ventured there, and although this act naturally gratified the Dutch Consistory, he felt bound to disregard De Mist's harsh proclamation against missionaries, and he allowed Van der Kemp and Read to return to their mission work amongst the Hottentots. But the hostility which the Dutch Calvinists had shown to the missionaries was fully and somewhat unwisely reciprocated. Mr. Read, in 1811, made a series of charges against the frontier Boers of ill-using the natives. Some of the charges were true enough, but some were disproved. A special Circuit Court was held on the eastern frontier of the colony to investigate these cases, and more than a thousand witnesses were examined. This bold, if injudicious, attack upon the usual Boer native policy did the natives very little good, and made every Boer detest the missionaries and their work more than ever. The Boers called this court the 'Black Circuit,' and the hatred of the missionaries which it engendered involved a bitter and implacable detestation of the British flag, which alone made the presence of missionaries from England possible. The memories of the 'Black Circuit' hardened the Boer's Calvinistic belief that the natives were predestined to a curse, and was a potent underlying factor of the Great Trek of 1837, when the emigrant Boers marched into the interior to found the Republics which we have just been compelled to subdue. Their main idea was to get beyond the reach of the hated British flag, which was to them the symbol of a Government that allowed missionaries to work, and of a religion that opposed their cherished Calvinism in teaching that natives have rights, and are capable of being made Christians. It was this intense hatred of the missionary, as an advocate of justice to the natives, that caused the Transvaal Boers many years afterwards to burn and destroy Dr. Livingstone's home, and wreck his missionary work. The homeless and ruined missionary was driven from his work to become the greatest of African explorers. But the Boers can claim no credit for their forcible diversion of Dr. Livingstone's life into the channel whereby he opened Central Africa to the missionary and to civilisation.

The abolition of slavery in 1834 was another severe blow to Dutch religious ideas. We blundered, as we British often do, in our method of carrying out this great change in South Africa. A great many of the Boers suffered pecuniarily through inadequate compensation for the value of their slaves. The Imperial Commissioners appraised the value of the slaves at the Cape at 3,041,290*l*. But the actual sum paid in compensation was only 1,247,401*l*. The British

Government desired to act justly, but things were grievously muddled somehow. The Boer's pocket was touched, and this made his religious grievance against the British more acute than ever. He considered that our religion had made us emancipate the slaves, an act which seemed to him flat rebellion against God's eternal decree that black men were meant to be slaves to the white. He proved the righteousness of slavery to his own satisfaction out of the Bible, as some of the slave-owners of America did, and he looked on the religion of the English as a denial of the Bible, as well as a denial of the Calvinism which was bred in his very bones. The fact that the British Government paid 9,000*l.* a year out of the State Treasury for the support of the Dutch Reformed ministers formed no adequate *solatium* for his religious grievances.

And matters became still worse when the Governor and Council of the Cape, under the British flag, exercised certain rights of State interference in the affairs of the Dutch Reformed ecclesiastical organisation, which they had inherited from the Dutch Government that had preceded them. The Dutch Reformed ministers wanted the prestige of an Established Church without any of its disabilities. In 1842 serious friction arose in the Dutch Synod. The then Governor, Sir George Napier, wrote officially to the Synod that he was 'most anxious to free the Church from the trammels of secular interference in all spiritual or purely ecclesiastical matters.' In furtherance of this policy an Ordinance was passed in 1843 by the Governor and Council to regulate the affairs of the Dutch Reformed Communion in the Cape Colony. It subsequently received the Royal assent and was duly promulgated, and is still in force. It repealed all former laws affecting the status of the Dutch Reformed Communion as a State Establishment, and reorganised it upon the basis of 'a merely voluntary association,' thus making it one of the ordinary religious denominations in the colony. The decisions of its Synods had no binding effect on persons or property save in such cases as affected persons who had voluntarily consented to be bound by such decisions or regulations. The Ordinance also provided that all grants from State funds to the Dutch Reformed ministers were to be deemed 'merely voluntary or gratuitous, and revocable at her Majesty's will and pleasure.' As a matter of fact all these grants were revoked, save in the case of existing holders, by an Act of the Cape Parliament in 1875. The Dutch did not offer any vigorous opposition to this Act, as it also swept away the State grants to Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics. Practical toleration of all religious bodies had long been practised in the Cape Colony in 1844. The Ordinance above quoted only legalised the sweeping away of the exclusive privileges of the Dutch Reformed Communion which had gradually come about by the process of events. The more enlightened Dutch ministers welcomed the Ordinance as giving freedom of debate

in their Synod, by ridding them of the presence of the 'Political Commissioner' who represented the Government in their General Assembly whenever it met. The back-country Boers did not realise that their communion had been practically disestablished, and matters went on peacefully enough for some time. Some of the Dutch ministers in the Cape Colony were able and enlightened men, and they were provoked by emulation with other religious denominations to make a beginning of missions to the heathen. Some of the better-class Boers were not averse to having their native servants taught, and in 1862 the Dutch Reformed Synod opened two mission stations in the Transvaal, one under Mr. M'Kidd of the Free Kirk of Scotland, and the other under Mr. Gouin, a Swiss minister from Geneva. Other mission stations have since been opened. But the enlightened few did not carry the majority with them. The vernacular term 'Sendling' or 'Missionary' was a word of contempt amongst the Boers, and has always remained so.

Early in the forties there was a great feeling of uneasiness amongst the Boers upon the subject of the education of the Dutch Reformed ministers. It had been customary to send them to Holland for training, but it was discovered that the universities of Holland had followed Geneva in rejecting the crude Calvinism of the sixteenth century. The Dutch of Holland, like the Scotch Presbyterians of to-day, had tacitly rejected the most monstrous dogmas of Calvinism. The Dutch began to explain away the decrees of the Synod of Dort, just as the Scotch ignored the literal teaching of the Westminster Confession. They even went further than the Scotch, and many became Rationalists of a German type.

But the Boers would have no modifications or abatements of their Calvinistic standards of doctrine. The cry was raised, 'No more ministers from Holland!' The Cape Synod appealed to Scotland in their perplexity as being more orthodox than Holland, and about a dozen Scotch Presbyterian ministers responded to the call and came to South Africa. Their sons and grandsons have in many cases become men of mark in South Africa, and, with few exceptions, have been loyal during the recent war. But the Boers do not like foreigners, although they prefer Scotchmen very much to other nationalities, as being linked to them by the same Church polity and creed. So they set to work to establish a Theological Seminary of their own at Stellenbosch. The standard of learning is creditable, but certainly for the last twenty years the Theological Seminary has been bound up with the politics of the Afrikaner Bond. The political feeling at Maynooth in favour of Irish Home Rule has been but a feeble abstract preference in comparison with the ardent Anti-British and Republican feeling amongst the theological students at Stellenbosch. The feeling was all the stronger because it did not manifest itself openly until the outbreak of the war.

It has been painfully manifest in the public utterances and private actions of the majority of the Dutch ministers during the war. The fact that so many of them have been arrested and deported as 'undesirables,' and that some have been on their trial for high treason, is proof enough of the political atmosphere in which they have been trained. I have always considered the Stellenbosch Seminary to be one of the chief causes of the Boer War. The Dutch Reformed ministers throughout South Africa wield just as great an influence upon their people as the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood exercise upon the small farmers and peasantry of Connaught and Munster. The Dutch Reformed ministers have for years past swayed the elections in the country districts of the Cape Colony, and they have been the most powerful supporters of the watchword 'Africa for the Afrikanders.' Stellenbosch supplied ministers for the Transvaal and the former Orange Free State. Constant interchanges of pastoral spheres of work took place between the Dutch clergy of the former Republics and the Cape Colony. There has been a political solidarity between the Dutch clergy throughout South Africa for many years past in favour of the ideas of which ex-President Kruger is the exponent. The more cultured clergy may have disapproved of some of his methods, but his aims were theirs as well. As a body they desired to see the States of South Africa federated under a Republican flag.

There are, of course, a few exceptions, *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*; but the exceptions prove the rule.

One notable exception is the Rev. H. A. Du Plessis, the Dutch Reformed minister of Lindley, in the Orange River Colony, a village well known as the scene of the Yeomanry surrender last year. In June 1900 Mr. Du Plessis saw that the cause of the Republics was hopeless, and he wisely took the oath of neutrality. On the 1st of February 1901 he addressed a solemn appeal, in Dutch and English, to his brethren of the Dutch Reformed Ministry, urging them to use their influence to stop the useless guerilla warfare. I quote his words from the English translation, signed by himself, which appeared in the *Cape Times*. He says, 'It is not civilised warfare any more on the part of the Burghers. They have become desperate, and as fanatics do things in conflict with a Christian spirit and civilisation.' I very much prefer to use the words of a Dutch Reformed minister than any of my own in bringing a charge of religious fanaticism against the Boers. I must quote Mr. Du Plessis again in proof of the truth of my charge against the Dutch ministers, as a body, as being keen political advocates of 'Krugerism.' He tells his brother ministers of his firm belief

that God has sent this war to purify our people, and not to be the birth of a United South Africa under the Republican flag. Unrighteousness, especially in the Transvaal, had reached a climax, and the time arrived in God's counsel to raise

the scourge and purify the people. God's great purpose was, and is still, to labour for our spiritual development through humbling us. That object He has not yet gained. There is no humiliation amongst our people. On the contrary, deplorable callousness is perceivable. Would it not be better if we looked more after their spiritual welfare, and had less to do with their political concerns? What a pity that the spiritual guides of the people are so *fascinated by politics*, that they have offered up the greater to the less! How dreadful it must be for the people after the war to lose both their independence and to miss their spiritual blessings! Oh that God would only give us eyes to see His way in this matter, and hearts to follow Him with childlike humility!

This earnest appeal was met by a fiercely scornful reply, filled with veiled treason, from a Dutch, Reformed minister of the Cape Colony, who is a British subject living under the protection of the King's Government.

Mr. Du Plessis has outgrown his Calvinistic training, and writes his inmost convictions, formed as they have been from his personal knowledge of the very heart of the questions with which he deals. The 'deplorable callousness' of the Boers in the present crisis of which he speaks so plainly is the direct outcome of Calvinism, which is a species of Christian fatalism, bearing the same sort of relation to Primitive Christianity that the fanatical cult of the Mahdi in the Soudan bore to the civilised form of Mahometanism which is the religion of many of our native judges, barristers, and officials in the empire of India. I do not desire to judge Calvinism save by its official standards of belief. The three official standards of the Dutch Reformed Communion all agree in their statements with the following words of John Calvin himself: . . .

We assert that by an eternal and unchangeable decree God hath determined whom He shall one day permit to have a share in eternal felicity, and whom He shall doom to destruction. In respect of the elect the decree is founded in His unmerited mercy, without any regard to human worthiness; but those whom He delivers up to damnation are, by a just and irreprehensible judgment, excluded from all access to eternal life.¹

There is no trace of this terrible parody of Christianity in the Primitive Church.

Calvin was French and therefore logical. He was also a lawyer, and therefore rigid and unbending in his inhuman precision of statement. He forgot that the human mind is necessarily limited, and that human logic and legalism cannot measure the Infinite Mind by finite standards. He appealed to St. Augustine in support of his theories, which he himself admitted to be *horrible*.² But St. Augustine's views on Predestination were far removed from those of Calvin, and even Augustinianism never became in any way part of the received and accepted doctrines of either Western or Eastern Christendom.

¹ Calvin, *Inst.* III. ii. par. xi.

² *Horribile decretum fateor*, Calvin, *Inst.* III. c. 23, sec. 7.

The logical outcome of Calvinism was that the elect can of themselves do nothing but sin, and are saved without any choice of good works on their own part; and that the non-elect, however pious they may be as individuals, are born to eternal damnation by an arbitrary decree of God. The Divine justice of a judgment according to men's lives and actions is absolutely lost to the mind of a Calvinist, and he also is apt to lose the sense of human justice. The pioneer Boers paralleled their conquest of the Transvaal by Joshua's conquest of Canaan. The native tribes were to them as the Hittites, Amorites, and the other Canaanitish tribes were to Joshua and his conquering Israelites. If God's elect under Joshua were permitted to conquer and slay the non-elect Canaanitish tribes, the Boers, as God's elect in South Africa, had an equal right to conquer and slay the native tribes of the Transvaal, and to thrust out all foreigners from South Africa—especially the accursed English, who, being reprobate themselves by God's decree, took the side of the slaves and the natives against the elect people chosen by God to be lords and rulers of the vast area of South Africa.

Many persons have wondered why the Transvaal Boers accepted so quietly the annexation of the Republic by Sir T. Shepstone in 1877. I was in South Africa at the time, and I saw President Burgers about eighteen months before the annexation took place. His appearance did not impress me much, but for all that he was a man with some brains and a history.

In 1862 a Dutch Reformed minister named Kotzé had the boldness to speak against the ultra-Calvinism of the Heidelberg Catechism in the General Assembly. The rule of the Dutch Reformed Communion was that the ministers were bound once a Sunday to expound a portion of the Heidelberg Catechism to the people from the pulpit. This rigid restriction of the 'liberty of prophesying' was an effectual safeguard against any such relaxation of pure Calvinist doctrine as has taken place in Holland and Scotland.

Mr. Kotzé objected to the Calvinist doctrine of the total and complete corruption of human nature, and he boldly declared that the words of Answer 60, 'although my conscience accuse me that I am still inclined always to all evil,' would not be true in the mouth of a heathen, much less in that of a Christian. He further stated that he agreed with a minister in Holland who said, 'I consider that the Catechism is wrong here.'

He was called upon by the Assembly to retract his words, but he declined to do so. The Assembly then deposed him from his office, and he appealed to the Civil Courts for redress. The Supreme Court of the Cape Colony found that he had been unlawfully deposed and ordered him to be reinstated. His success emboldened Mr. Burgers, the Dutch Reformed minister of Hanover in the Cape Colony, to go still further in opposing the harsh Calvinism of the

formularies, and in some points he is said to have denied the Christian faith. He also was suspended, and appealed to the Supreme Court and won his case.

The General Assembly then appealed to the Privy Council, and Lord Westbury, that most cynical and able of Law Lords, delivered judgment in favour of the future Transvaal President on the 30th of May 1865. But it was a barren victory for Mr. Burgers. His co-religionists held him to be a heretic, and the General Assembly at its next session carried a motion to adjourn *sine die* rather than allow him and Mr. Kotzé to take their seats in it as Dutch Reformed ministers. The Calvinist majority was too obstinate and bitter to allow of any liberal interpretation of its formularies. The two successful litigants found themselves practically without congregations. And then Mr. Burgers took to politics. In those days news slowly filtered through South Africa. The Transvaal Boers were too ignorant to follow or understand the arguments of the Privy Council or the debates of the General Assembly. They were disgusted with the failure of President Pretorius to get the better of Governor Keate of Natal, in the famous 'Keate Award' of 1870 with regard to some disputed territory not far from the newly-discovered diamond fields of Kimberley. They had heard that Mr. Burgers was 'slim' and had won victories in the law courts, and they promptly elected him President. He had great visions of a universal Afrikaner Republic. Mr. Kruger and the Afrikaner Bond subsequently annexed and exploited his ideas when his period of government ended in failure and disaster. Before very long, the Boers of the Transvaal suspected him of *railways* and *heresy*. To use the words of Mr. Noble's well-known *Official Handbook of the Cape and South Africa*, 'his railway scheme was disliked by the Conservative Boers, and to a large party of them, who had fervent and deep-rooted religious convictions, he became obnoxious on account of what were supposed to be his heterodox views.' In 1876 a large party of Boers 'trekked' away into the interior to escape from his impious government. They crossed into the Portuguese territory of Angola and formed a settlement at Humpata under the Portuguese flag, where they still are. They got a schoolmaster for this settlement, but promptly expelled him for the impiety of teaching that the world is *round* instead of *flat*.

President Burgers then declared war against the powerful native chief Secocoeni, but the Boers, who are brave enough as we know, played the coward on purpose to thwart the President. They would not fight for a heretical President, nor would they pay him taxes. Their Calvinism came first, and a good many of them, including Mr. Kruger, were of the 'Dopper' sect, a religious body which protested against the Dutch Reformed Communion at the Cape for laxity, and innovations in public worship.

Their religious fanaticism led them to all lengths in their determination to rid themselves of the heretic Burgers, who showed no disposition to resign the Presidency. Sir Theophilus Shepstone appeared on the scene as a *deus ex machina* with twenty-five policemen. The Boers welcomed him as a deliverer from Burgers. Mr. Kruger and his party were ready enough to accept the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, as the price paid for the dismissal of Burgers, and Mr. Kruger himself was glad enough to get rid of his rival, and at the same time to accept Imperial pay.

Their religious vengeance was wreaked on Mr. Burgers to the full. They used Sir T. Shepstone as their instrument of vengeance, and pretended to acquiesce peaceably in the annexation. But Mr. Kruger was very deep and very 'slim.' He knew that there would be a revulsion of feeling directly Burgers was got rid of. The elect people had used the British flag to get rid of their reprobate President, and now they wanted to pull it down because it had served their turn. Mr. Kruger foresaw this and knew that the elect people needed an orthodox Calvinist as their leader. He was the man of the hour. He made his plans, and he saw that Sir Bartle Frere, who had fathomed his scheme, was not supported by the Home Government.

The rest of the story we know too well. We despised the Boer because he played the coward against Secocoeni. We did not realise that his Calvinism, which then made him a coward, would also make him a dangerous enemy. We learnt the lesson at Laing's Nek, Ingogo, and Majuba Hill. After the unhappy retrocession of the Transvaal in 1881 the Calvinism of the Boer was still further hardened by his victories. The defeat of the hated British had been so easy that it seemed to him to be clear evidence that he was destined to rule the whole of South Africa by an irresistible Divine decree. There was nothing of the spirit of Christianity in the Boer when he ascribed the British defeats to the hand of God. He considered himself the instrument of Divine vengeance upon the British, and there was none of the humility which is a necessary part of all true thanksgiving. He was puffed up with a pride begotten of Calvinistic fatalism. The only parallel that I can think of that adequately describes his state of mind was that of the fanatical followers of the Mahdi after the defeat of Hicks Pasha and their early victories in the Soudan. President Kruger was the Calvinistic Mahdi, and the future war against England, which General Joubert foresaw after Majuba in his well-known conversation with Sir Evelyn Wood, was a 'Jihad' or 'Holy War' against the British Empire. The subsequent annexation of Bechuanaland in 1883, and of the portion of Zululand round Vryheid, were the beginnings of the new policy of conquest and absorption. But the Boer's Calvinism did not cause

ready for war, and he was very much surprised as well to find that the defeated British had plucked up enough courage to send an expedition to Bechuanaland at all. In 1890 Mr. Rhodes was only just in time to save the whole of Rhodesia from being annexed to the Transvaal, and the discovery of the Transvaal goldfields had filled President Kruger's coffers to overflowing, so that the secret war preparations went on with plenty of money behind them.

President Burgers had brought some Hollanders into the Transvaal, but the Boers detested them, mainly because of their suspicion that they agreed with his religious views.

President Kruger flooded the country with Hollanders, but was astute enough to get his people to accept their aid. The Hollanders were most careful not to offend the religious prejudices of the Boers, but even Dr. Leyds did not escape suspicion. His religious opinions—or perhaps rather his absence of religious opinions—became on one occasion the subject of debate in the Volksraad.

But the Hollanders were possessed of a great ideal. They feared the absorption of Holland by Germany, and they thought that the universal Afrikaner Republic would find room for their national aspirations, and that the ancient glories of their race would find their full development in South Africa. And so they were very careful indeed to conceal any views which ran contrary to the religious fanaticism of the Boers, whom they purposed to use in furtherance of their own national ambitions. The war preparations were continued, under the guidance of European experts, with thoroughness and tenacity. A fiscal question, and the tact of Mr. Rhodes in dealing with the Cape Dutch, for a time caused a coolness between the Bond leaders and Pretoria. But the Raid brought matters to a climax. The religious tie between the Republics and the Cape Colony Dutch at once asserted itself with binding force. The 'Holy War' was at hand, and, as President Kruger said, the real question at issue was not the claims of the Uitlanders, or the policy of Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Alfred Milner, but the undoing of the Act of the 10th of January, 1806. The Afrikaner flag was to fly over the historic Castle of Capetown, and supplant the hated Union Jack. The Boers were determined to fight, and it is said on good authority that the Ultimatum was in type in the Government Printing Office for five days before it was sent, and while negotiations were ostensibly being considered. A most interesting light has been shed upon the religious fanaticism of the Boers by some letters in the Cape Press, by one who fought on their side. He says :—

Paul Kruger preached a 'Holy War,' promising eternal life to those who fell. About ten years previously, a young man in the Transvaal had an inspired vision. He saw the British and Boers engaged in a fearful war. Finally he saw great bodies of troops and burghers, from opposite directions, moving toward a place called 'Verkeerde Vlei,' where a great battle was fought, ending in the total destruction of the British. A very religious young woman, after much prayer,

...the same as the above, only a

few days before the reorganisation in Kroonstad at the end of March, 1900, and again the name of the great battlefield was 'Verkeerde Vlei.' This took root, and was heard on all sides, especially amongst our older men, and I have every reason to know that they actually believed it. The burghers took the field in better spirits, and the affairs at Sanna's Post and Mostert's Vlei were propitious. De Wet had Brabant's Horse securely surrounded near Wepener, and their surrender was daily expected. The main commando was moving on the Bloemfontein waterworks. One can imagine the feelings of the men, when on Tuesday, May 1st, the scouts came in and reported the advance of a British force, estimated at 30,000 men and many guns, and the name of the farm between us was *Verkeerde Vlei*. I own myself to having had a very creepy sensation, and was almost superstitious also, and I really thought we were on the eve of the greatest and bloodiest struggle of the war. I was wrong. I reckoned that the burghers would fight as one man and stand to the last, however the battle went, while the great majority of the burghers just intended to do as they had always done—keep out of danger and retreat in good time—the only difference being a desire in this case to be as near as possible to see the Lord descend with His angel battalions to slaughter the British troops. The advanced bodies took up positions, but on the first shells bursting in the same old style, and the expected angels not appearing at once, the main body retreated in panic. The fighting men fought bravely until ordered to retreat, and the *Verkeerde Vlei bubble had burst*. Luckily for us, the British did not pursue, as there was little to prevent them capturing our whole convey of hundreds of waggons.

The same writer tells us that the Boers believed that two angel generals fought for them at Tálana Hill, and that angelic intervention helped them on another occasion. We quote his own words:—

Despite the real Reformed and Netherlands Reformed creeds which our people professed, there never was a greater fanatical nation, nor one more imbued with superstition and a firm belief in fatalism than the Boers, and the greatest of all were the ministers of the Gospel. I am judging them by my experience of their sermons before hostilities, and their own teaching during the war up to the present time.

The two angel generals at Dundee were conjured up in the brains of a minister and clothed in reality by others, and I personally had another story from a minister, who assured me that he had it direct from President Steyn, and earnestly professed to believe it, that one day during the fighting on the Tugela between January 18th and 24th, 1900, a large body of British had crossed the river, covered by heavy artillery fire, and were just on the point of storming the Boer positions, with every probability of success, when they suddenly turned to the right, and commenced volleying into a ridge not occupied by any Boers, while the Boers in the front position shot them down like sheep until they retreated in the greatest disorder. Some prisoners were taken, and being asked why they had attacked an empty ridge, replied that the ridge was literally crowded by Boer regiments all dressed in pure white. Another clear case of Divine help, and the laagers soon rang with it. The Lord was with us, and we were sure of victory.

The writer does not apparently see that what he calls the 'real Reformed' and the 'Netherlands Reformed' creeds are the true causes of the fanaticism he deplors. The difference between the two parties, which at one time seriously agitated the Transvaal, is only in non-essentials. Both bodies are Calvinistic to the core.

It is interesting to note the effects which this writer

Mr. Smuts (a late first-class man in the Cambridge Law Tripos) in the Transvaal, and by Messrs. Merriman and Sauer and by Advocate Malan (another Dutch Cambridge graduate) in the Cape Colony. Advocate Malan, as editor of *Ons Land*, has been prosecuted by the Cape Attorney-General and sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment for seditious libel on General French and the British troops. Many others who are still at large deserve to share his fate for the crime of stirring up the ignorant Cape Colony Boers to rebellion. As a well-known instance of this ignorance, we may cite the fact that some Transvaalers thought that 'Mr. Franchise' was their enemy as well as Mr. Chamberlain. They were ready to shoot 'Mr. Franchise' when they caught him, and they resolutely boycotted 'Chamberlain's Cough Remedy' in the Transvaal, because they believed that by this means they could touch the pocket of the present Secretary of State for the Colonies. A task of stupendous magnitude lies before us in attempting to deal with these people after the war. When I was serving as Acting Chaplain to the Forces in 1899 on General French's lines of communication at Rosmead Junction, I was told on excellent authority that a colonial Boer farmer in the neighbourhood had said that if the Boers did not win he would burn his Bible, and have no more to do with God. I have since heard the same sort of statements made in other quarters, and although I have no means of verifying them, I believe them to be substantially true. A broken Calvinist is a desperate and illogical man. When the logic of events caused the Scottish Cameronians to despair of their position, they actually intrigued with the Chevalier, a bigoted Roman Catholic prince, in 1708 against the Government of Queen Anne.³ The end of the war will find the mass of the ignorant Boers in a condition of religious despair. All that they have been taught to believe about themselves as the elect people, all the promises of God-given victory which Paul Kruger and their ministers of religion have perpetually set before them, will be to them as the baseless fabric of a vision. They will merit the compassion and pity of every God-fearing man in our Empire. Their own ministers have, most of them, ministered so fatally to their political delusions that they will be as sheep without a shepherd. There are a few amongst them who will give them wise counsel, such as Mr. Du Plessis, whose words are quoted in this article. There are some ministers like the Rev. Andrew Murray, of saintly life and wide spiritual power, whose devotional works are read and valued in England. But the political taint is the predominant characteristic of most of them. Not long before the Raid I was travelling to Johannesburg with a Transvaal Dutch Reformed minister. He was evidently no politician, and he spoke of the failings of his co-religionists with deep feeling. He said to me, 'There is no future before our Church. It will be superseded by other religious bodies.' I told

him then that I did not agree with him at all. But he knew *then* what I know *now*.

The problem before us bristles with difficulties. Dean Green of Maritzburg, who was appointed rector of Maritzburg in 1848, is the oldest and most experienced of the English clergy in South Africa. He wrote recently a most touching and powerful letter to the *Guardian*, earnestly urging upon the English clergy to help the Boer to build up a simpler and gentler Christianity upon the ruins of his Calvinism. We have in South Africa clergy, born in the country, and knowing Dutch as well as English, who might make a beginning in this work. But the Boer prejudice against the English Church will die very hard. One of our clergy in the Transvaal told me that he had applied personally to Mr. Kruger for a small Government grant for his school. 'But you English clergy don't teach the Bible in your schools, do you?' said Mr. Kruger, in his ignorance of the strife between Church schools and Board schools in England. The clergyman had some trouble in convincing Mr. Kruger that the English Church taught the Bible in the schools, but I don't know if he got his grant. A small grant was given to English Church schools by the late Free State Government, but objections were latterly raised to it, notably by Christian De Wet. If the Boer *does* change his religion he is in earnest about it. I remember a case of a Boer farmer who joined the English Church from conviction, and 'trekked' over fifty miles in his waggon to be confirmed by the bishop of this diocese. But, as my Boer friend told me, his relations were rather bitter about it, and his old father required disabusing of the strange idea that the English Church *does* not teach out of the Bible. For myself I must admit I see no immediate solution of the problem before us. There must be prompt readiness on the part of all our clergy to show kindness to individual Boers where it is possible. That, I know, will be the case in every part of South Africa. A good number of the younger Afrikaners have almost openly cast off their religion. These younger men will have learned a lesson from the war, and it is possible that some of them may be won to higher ideals of life.

My main object in this paper is to show how the religious ideals of over two hundred years ago have dominated the Boer since Van Riebeeck's first settlement in 1654, how they have influenced his native policy, and how they have finally plunged him into national ruin and destruction. The Boers were the only real and practical Calvinists of the nineteenth century with ideas unmodified by truer presentments of Christianity. Their religious ideals caused their political ideals to take shape. Both alike have perished before their eyes. It is our duty to see that their loss is repaired in order that they may take their rightful places as free citizens of a free Empire.

THE NEXT CORONATION

THE coronations of George the Second and George the Third were performed with all the pomp and splendour that could be contrived, but the ceremony reached a climax with the coronation of George the Fourth. That amiable monarch endeavoured to conciliate public opinion by an unexampled display of the glories of regality. This scheme for securing popularity had the advantage of involving no sacrifice of the royal inclinations; and although 250,000*l.* is doubtless a somewhat alarming price to pay for one day's pageantry, still the money, from the King's point of view, was probably not ill-spent. Accounts of this coronation¹ deserve special attention: the ceremonies observed (most of them, it may be, for the last time) embrace, as it were, the whole history of English coronations, right back to the time when Saxon Ethelred the Second² was crowned by Dunstan at Kingston, A.D. 978. Could that austere Saxon albino—chiefly known to posterity, by virtue of the Bull of Canonisation promulgated by Alexander the Third, as St. Edward the Confessor—have been present in the Abbey at the crowning of George the Fourth, he would have found little that was novel in the service. Could Richard the Second have taken part in the ceremonies observed in the procession, or at Westminster Hall, in 1821, very few incidents would have seemed unfamiliar to him. But ten years later came a striking change.

William the Fourth reversed his predecessors' methods, and courted public favour by declaring for rigid economy. A very natural reaction had set in, and the King's attitude at the time merely furnishes another illustration of personal predispositions happily coinciding with the dictates of policy; but from some points of view the result seems much to be regretted. William the Fourth would have dispensed with the coronation altogether, and he corresponded with Lord Grey³ upon the advisability of such

¹ Sir Walter Scott, *Gent. Mag.* 1821, pt. ii, pp. 104–110.

² The various rituals are compared and tabulated by Taylor, *Glories of Regality*, pp. 369–376. The Dunstan ritual is founded on the Pontifical of Egbert of York, the oldest extant ritual in Europe. Surtees Soc., *Pontifical of Egbert*.

³ *Correspondence of William the Fourth and Earl Grey*, i. pp. 301, 302.

a course. The King's suggestion was even debated in the House of Lords. Ultimately a compromise was decided upon. The invariable order of a coronation had hitherto consisted of four distinct ceremonies: (1) the assembling in Westminster Hall; (2) the procession to the Abbey; (3) the service in the Abbey; and (4) the great coronation banquet. It was settled to omit everything but the service in Westminster Abbey. An effort was made by Lord Grey to stigmatise the omitted ceremonies as at variance with the genius of the age, and suited to another period of society; and he composed a paper to this effect for the King to read. The Archbishop, however, objected; and the King contented himself with making a little speech to the Council, in which he declared that he would be crowned to satisfy the tender consciences of those who thought it necessary, but he considered it his duty to have the performance conducted as cheaply as possible.⁴ The whole discussion was quite typical. It was 'the genius of the age' to prefer white-wash to mediæval fresco. When all was over, Ministers were much gratified at the result: popular enthusiasm had been great, while the bill barely exceeded 42,000*l*. This last precedent was closely followed at the coronation of Queen Victoria. It is true there was a cavalcade from Buckingham Palace, but there was nothing in any sense approaching a revival of the ancient procession. Victoria has passed to her rest, and, with the advent of another sovereign, the question of another coronation is again being mooted. It is also abundantly clear that, so far from the matter being one of settled precedent, we have in reality arrived at a crucial point, the parting of many ways.

A coronation might well be dispensed with. In some of its aspects even the religious service is no more than the outward visible form of long obsolete sacraments, the residuary calx, as it were, of what once no doubt contained much valuable metal. It cannot be said to-day that a king is one whit the more kingly and his person more sacred for being crowned, or the people, by this means, more firmly established in their sovereign rights and privileges. It is ages, too, since the law has attached much value to the crowning of a king. When the lawyers of the Restoration were busy decimating the surviving leaders of the Commonwealth by due process of law, the proceedings of one day alone caused them any trouble. Could the act of severing the head of Charles from his body, they argued, be alleged to have been committed against the peace of the late or the present King? Judge Mallet caused some confusion by maintaining that an English day was indivisible in law; and therefore, as Charles the Second was certainly our lawful King during part of that day, no part of it had been in the reign of Charles I. But admitting that

indifference, it is none the less quite certain that to dispense with it altogether would be highly unpopular. London has lately shown a decidedly increasing taste for the pageant.

Another and perhaps the simplest course would be to follow the last two precedents, agree to finally abolish both the procession and banquet, place 60,000*l.* or so to the credit of the Earl Marshal, and request his Grace to furnish the best entertainment that such a sum will command. It will at least be possible to provide a fairly imposing military procession; and the man in the street, it must be confessed, cares very little about anything else. Then, assuming the Duke of Norfolk's efforts meet with their due measure of success, history will be able to record that the coronation of Edward VII. was, like its prototypes, a happy compromise between economy and parade.

A third course would be to revive ancient precedents, and arrange for the coronation ceremonies again to take place in full state as they did in the days of the Georges, the Stuarts, the Tudors, and as far back as historical records go. This course, it is contended, is the one that should be adopted; but it is admittedly not one likely to commend itself to persons unacquainted with the history of English coronations. They naturally regard the real ceremony as beginning and ending with the service in Westminster Abbey; and, perhaps rightly, consider that it is for those who call attention to incidents anciently annexed to the religious ceremony to show cause for their revival. Nor, it is feared, would it be sufficient merely to show, as can easily be done, that the ancient procession on foot to the Abbey and the concluding festivities of the banquet-room cannot be regarded as later additions to the solemnities of the Church, but that they belonged essentially to the very form and process of regal investiture. Something more than mere antiquity must be pleaded for twice-broken customs. Even so, it is confidently maintained, there is much in many of these ceremonies to commend them, over and above their great antiquity. One thing at least seems perfectly clear, that the question whether these venerable links with the past are or are not to be finally severed rests ultimately with the public opinion of to-day, and turns upon the retention or rejection of these ceremonies at the next coronation. A third adverse precedent would be fatal. At the same time it must be candidly conceded that one of the first objects of any future coronation should be to interest and amuse the general public. This object will be but slightly and indirectly furthered by the revival of ancient precedents, which only directly benefit the privileged few;^a but this argument applies with equal

^a This sort of procession (the cavalcade from Buckingham Palace) is incomparably better than the old ceremonial which so much fuss was made about, for the banquet would only have admitted the privileged few. . . . — *Greville Memoirs*, the 29th of June, 1838.

force to the proceedings in Westminster Abbey. No one, it is imagined, has ever urged the substitution of new ceremonies, in place of the old religious service, because the Abbey will not seat millions.* The suggestion looks ridiculous. In fact, it is sufficiently obvious that participation in coronation ceremonies proper must unfortunately, but of necessity, be confined to the few. Therefore, while the all-important claims of the general public are frankly acknowledged, and will be dealt with later, it must be insisted that these claims have nothing to do with the immediate question under consideration, namely, what form the next coronation should take—the old historical form, or that eviscerated remnant which did duty for a coronation on the last two occasions?

One of the first acts preliminary to every coronation—and in this respect the last two cases form no exception—is the constitution by the sovereign of a judicial body known as the Court of Claims;⁶ and the issue of a proclamation which rectifies that certain persons are bound by tenure of their inheritance, or otherwise, to perform certain services for their sovereign at the coronation. Such persons are enjoined to appear before the Court of Claims, so that their pretensions may be adjudicated upon. It is these services, which, for the most part, are performed during the procession and the banquet in Westminster Hall, which lend such a special antiquarian charm to the whole ceremony. It is particularly worthy of note that the last proclamation of the kind referred to was issued on the 4th of April 1838, and apparently contemplated the revival of ancient precedents, including the procession and banquet, with all incident services. It was left to a subsequent proclamation, appearing only four days later, to notify those concerned that it was intended again to omit the procession and banquet, and that the Queen dispensed for the particular occasion with the performance of the services affected by the alteration. The framers of the proclamation were, however, careful to add that this dispensation was not to operate as a waiver of any future claims and privileges. The question therefore at issue in this instance is not whether certain extinct services should be resuscitated, but whether subsisting rights and privileges should be maintained, a question obviously intended to be left open for final determination at the next coronation by those responsible for the proclamations alluded to. But the question of retaining these services of Grand Serjeantry, as they are technically called, and that of reviving the ancient procession and banquet cannot be separated. If

* First mentioned at Richard the Second's accession. 'The Duke of Lancaster, who for his dukedom of Lancaster and earldoms of Leicester and Lincoln, was admitted upon his claim to be High Steward, bearer of the King's chief sword "Curtana," and carver at that solemnity . . . held the Steward's Court several days in Westminster Hall to receive the claims of such persons as by certain tenures or custom . . . were entitled at that ceremony.'—'Richard the Second,' *Hist. Eng.* 170⁶, vol. i.

the former point still remains open for present decision, so does the latter: a consideration not altogether wanting in argumentative value. It is undeniably true that a plea to retain subsisting rights is far more often successful than a plea to restore customs once abandoned. These ancient ceremonies, however, might well be left to justify their own retention, without the adventitious aid of saving clauses in proclamations.

The lord of the manor of Scrivelsby in Lincolnshire (Leland spells it Screelsby, and this appears to be the correct pronunciation), is bound by the tenure of his inheritance to perform the service of 'King's Champion' at the coronation banquet. Tradition asserts that one Robert of Marmion received lands in Normandy and England on this tenure by grant from William the First. It is at least certain that in Edward the First's reign the Marmions held vast estates, including Tamworth and Scrivelsby. In the twentieth year of Edward the First, the last Lord Marmion died without male issue. Tamworth passed through the elder female branch to the Frevilles, and Scrivelsby through a younger branch to the Ludlows, and then to the Dymokes. The first account of a Dymoke performing the service is at the coronation of Richard the Second, the last time a Dymoke appeared was at George the Fourth's coronation banquet. Documentary evidence connecting this service with Scrivelsby dates back to 7 Edward the Third. An *inquisitio post mortem* of that year states that the manor of Scrivelsby is holden by Grand Serjeantry, to wit, the service of finding on the day of coronation an armed knight, who shall prove by his body, if need be, that the King is true and rightful heir to the kingdom.⁷ It would, however, be rash to assume, even in the absence of all evidence to the contrary, that the service originated as a unique privilege appertaining to a single manor. In earlier days it can hardly be doubted that the office was not hereditary, and some evidence exists of persons unconnected with Scrivelsby having held the title. For instance, there is a charter of Henry the First, referred to in the *Monasticon* (ii. 973), to which one of the witnesses subscribes himself as Robertus de Bajocis, Campio regis. At the coronation of Richard the Second Baldwin Freville counterclaimed for the right to perform the service.⁸ It is probably due to this incident that the ceremony is for the first time recorded by ancient chroniclers.

⁷ '... manerij de Scrivelby, quod tenetur de dñs Rege in capite per magnam serjantiam, videl' ad inveniendum die coronacionis dñi Regis qui pro tempore fuerit unum militem eques' armatum ad probandum per corpus suum, si necesse fuerit, versus quemcunque quod dñs Rex qui coronatus est illo die est verus et rectus heres regni; ...' Inter Recorda Curie Cancellarie, No. 33.

⁸ Also at Henry the Fourth's coronation. 'Baldewinus de Frevill chivaler clamat venire ad coronacionem dñi Regis armis regis de liberacione Regis universaliter armatus, &c.' E Rotulo Serviciorum in die Coronationis Regis Henrici Quarti.

In the mean time Sir John Dymoke, that claimed to be king's champion, had been at the king's armorie and stable, where he had chosen according to his tenure the best armour save one, and the best steed save one :⁹ albeit Sir Baldwin Freville claimed the same office, but could not obtain it. So that the said Sir John Dymoke, having armed himself, and being mounted on horseback, came to the abbey gates with two riding before him, the one carrying his spear, and the other his shield, staying there till mass should be ended. But the lord Henrie Percie, lord marshal, appointed to make way before the king, with the duke of Lancaster, lord steward, the lord Thomas of Woodstock, lord constable, and the lord marshal's brother, Sir Thomas Percie, being all mounted on great horses, came to the knight and told him that he ought not to come at that time, but when the king was at dinner ; and therefore it should be good for him to unarm himself for awhile, and take his ease, and rest till the appointed time were come.¹⁰

Commentators take hold of this account to argue that Sir John Dymoke was new to the business, and obviously ignorant of when to present himself. But the evidence seems to show that Dymoke was right and the Earl Marshal wrong. Ancient precedent, at least, strictly required the champion's challenge to be proclaimed in the streets as well as at the banquet ; and a Dymoke accordingly figured in Henry the Fourth's coronation procession. The appearance of the champion at the banquet takes place after the first course is ended. 'He is escorted into the hall, riding between the Earl Marshal and the Lord High Constable. The knight is armed at all points, and his horse is trapped in black housings, embroidered with silver lions.¹¹ As he enters the hall, Garter King of Arms accosts him : 'Sir knight, from whence come you, and what is your pretence ?' 'You shall quickly hear,' the champion replies, 'the cause of my coming and pretence.' His herald of arms then cries 'Oyez,' and proclaims the challenge. 'If there be any person, of what estate or degree soever he be, who shall deny that our sovereign is the rightful inheritor and king of this realm, here is his champion, who saith that he lieth, and is a false traitor, being ready in person to combat with him, and in this quarrel will adventure his life against him on what day soever shall be appointed him.' The precise words of the challenge vary considerably on each occasion ; but, in substance, the challenge conforms to the old mode of trial by battle in appeals : 'Tunc interrogabit eum Constabularius quisquam ipse sit homo qui armatus venit ad januam listarum, quod sibi nomen, et quæ causa veniendi ? Et respondebit Appellans, A. de K.--Appellans, qui venio ad hoc iter &c., ad faciendum, &c.'¹² After the champion's challenge has been three times repeated in different parts of the hall, the King

⁹ 'C'est assavoir que le Roi lui face avoir le vielle de son coronement un des bons destrers que le Roi eit, qv le sele et ove toutz les harnys bien covert de foer, ensement ove toutz les armes q'appendoient au corps le Roi, ausi entierment come le Roi meames le duist avoir sil dуст aler en un bataill mortell.' Inter Recorda Curie Cancellarie &c., memb. 45 ; see Taylor, Appendix.

¹⁰ Holinshed.

¹¹ The arms of the Dymokes are : Sable, two lions passant argent, crowned or.

calls for a gold bowl to drink his health. The knight receives the bowl for his fee, drains the remaining contents, exclaiming, 'Long live the King!' and proceeds to back his horse out of the hall with as much grace as he can command.¹³ Sir Walter Scott was present on the last occasion in 1821,¹⁴ and expressed much delight at the performance. All he ventured to find fault with was the shield that had been selected—a round rondache or Highland target, instead of the three-cornered heater shield: a trivial objection from so critical a spectator. It is a noteworthy coincidence that a short time before the coronation of George the Fourth wager of battle had been formally abolished, owing to the remarkable trial arising out of the murder of Mary Ashford.¹⁵ It was suggested at the time, but not seriously maintained, that the tenure of Scrivelsby was affected by the repealing Act.¹⁶

As might be expected, history contains no record of the champion's challenge having been accepted; but there was a famous myth current after George the Third's coronation, to the effect that the Young Pretender, disguised in female attire, had found a place in the ladies' gallery during the banquet, and, at the appearance of the champion, flung down a white glove into the middle of the hall. The story is highly improbable on the face of it, and the absence of corroboration at first hand is significant. 'I asked my Lord Marshal,' says David Hume, 'the reason of this strange fact. "Ay," says he, "a gentleman told me so who saw him there, and whispered in his ear: "Your Royal Highness is the last of all mortals whom I should expect to see here." "It was curiosity that led me," said the other; "but I assure you," he added, "that the person who is the cause of all this magnificence is the person I envy least."'" One account dealing with the champion incident adds that Dymoke picked up the lady's glove, and exclaimed, 'Who is my fair foe?' little suspecting the real import of the occurrence.

The barons—that is to say, the burgesses, or freemen—of the Cinque Ports claim to carry the canopies of gold cloth under which the King and Queen walk in the procession. These canopies are provided with gilt bells at the corners and supported by silver staves. Thirty-two freemen of the ports form the full complement of bearers. Hastings and Sandwich each provide six; Dover, Hythe, Rye, Romney, and Winchelsea provide four each. The history of the service is not easy to trace. It is usually stated to have origi-

¹³ The ceremony is carefully rehearsed. 'Last night Westminster Hall was illuminated, and John Dymoke, Esq., put on his armour and tried a grey horse, which his late Majesty rode at the battle of Dettingen, before His Royal Highness the Duke of York, Prince Henry Frederick, the Duke of Devonshire, and many other persons of distinction.'—*Public Advertiser*, the 19th of September, 1761.

¹⁴ The service was performed by deputy; the lord of the manor being in Holy Orders.

¹⁵ *Ashford v. Thornton*, 1 Barn. & Ald. p. 405..

¹⁶ 59 Geo. III. c. 46.

nated with John, and to have been in the nature of a reward for the readiness with which the Cinque Ports had assisted him in his unfortunate voyages to and from Normandy. It is also said that at one time the barons of the Cinque Ports had the further privilege of holding the pall over the King when he received the sacred unction.¹⁷ Ancient authorities do not lend much support to these views. For instance, in an account of the coronation of Richard the First¹⁸ four barons are represented as holding a canopy (*umbraculum*) over the King in the procession, and the mere circumstance of our not possessing even earlier accounts is no evidence that the service was not performed on previous occasions. Froissart describes this service in his account of Henry the Fourth's coronation:—

And then all the prelates and clergy came from Westminster church to the palace to fetch the King with procession; and so he went to the church in procession, and all the lords with him, in their robes of scarlet furred with meniver barred of their shoulders according to their degrees; and over the King was borne a cloth of estate of blue with four bells of gold; and it was borne by four burghesses of the ports, as Dover, and other.

At Charles the Second's coronation the number of barons to each canopy had finally increased to sixteen. A charter of this King confirms the Cinque Ports in their prescriptive right to perform this service. 'Consideration is had of the most pleasing and acceptable service which the barons of the Cinque Ports, and of the ancient towns aforesaid, have performed and payed to us at our inauguration to the crown of this, our kingdom of England, according as in times past they did and were bound to do to our progenitors, the Kings and Queens of England, at their respective coronations, the time of the contrary being never remembered to have been.'¹⁹

It is somewhat doubtful who originally held the pall over the King during the unction. After the institution of the Garter this office was performed by four knights of that order, and not by barons of the Cinque Ports. The regular practice seems to have been for the latter to stand at the west door of the choir during the service in the Abbey.²⁰ The thirty-two barons have the additional privilege of dining at a table on the King's right hand at the coronation banquet, a privilege apparently conferred by William the First as a return for their successful guardianship of the Channel. At the coronation of George the Fourth the barons came dressed in the costume of their Elizabethan predecessors in office.²¹ The dress was scarlet slashed

¹⁷ Relying on Richard of Devizes; e.g. Wm. Jones, *Crowns and Coronations*, p. 116.

¹⁸ MS. Cott., *Vesp. civ.* p. 130. Also Rapin (1732), i. 245; Hoveden (Rolls ed.), iii. 10; and *Memorials of Richard I.* (ib.) ii. 308.

¹⁹ Taylor, p. 140.

²⁰ Planché, *Regal Records*, p. 148.

²¹ The names of the sixteen barons were: Hastings: Hon. W. H. Scott, T. Dawkins, E. Milward. Sandwich: T. Stewart, C. Emmerson, G. Noakes. Dover: E. B. Wilbraham, H. Latham. Romney: B. Cobb, C. Dering. Hythe: S. Marjoribanks, W. Deedes. Rye: W. P. Lamb, T. Dodson. Winchelsea: H. Brougham, L. Cannon.

with blue, with blue and gilt edging; to this was added a blue surcoat, scarlet hose, and white shoes with red bows. The hat was plumed with three feathers, two black and one pink. The dresses at this coronation were a costly, though very effective, innovation. On former occasions the Court dress of the day had been worn. The barons claim the canopies, bells, and staves as their fee for attendance; but the Dean and Chapter of Westminster have, on occasions, successfully urged their own claims to some of these perquisites. 'Quos pannos idem barones suo jure obtinebant, sed hastae cum campanellis debentur eccl'ie Westm' recto jure.'²²

The Lord Mayor and twelve principal citizens of London, chosen by the commonalty, claim to assist the Chief Butler of England in the execution of his office on the day of the coronation, and they are entitled to sit at a table next the cupboard on the left side of Westminster Hall. The claim is older than Richard the Second. After dinner the Lord Mayor presents the King with wine in a gold cup. 'Major Londini clamabat officium pincernae, et executus est, accipiens cupam auream.'²³ The Mayor of Oxford and eight burgesses claim to be present, and to perform certain functions at the banquet in virtue of charters granted by the first three Henries. 'The Mayor of Oxenford claimeth to ayde the chief butler in the service of ale at the barr; and for profe sheweth olde presidentes.'²⁴ The Mayor receives three maple cups for his fee. In very ancient times these services seem to have been differently distributed. A chronicler of Richard the First's coronation has it that 'comites et barones, sicut eorum solebant patres, servierunt, civesque Cantuar' in panetria, cives London in pincernaria, at in coquina cives Winton' ministrabant.' London, it is further asserted, had secured the buttery from Winchester, the original holders, for the sum of 200 marks. It was then the latter were told off to the kitchen, at which they felt much humbled. London on one occasion came to regret her purchase; why, does not appear, but she petitioned Edward the Third for a discharge: 'nous payerons volonters le fee, issent que nous soyons descharges de la service.'²⁵

The lord of the Isle of Man is bound by the tenure of his inheri-

²² 'Chron. Rishang,' MS. Cott. Faust. B. lx. '24. The Barons of the Cinque Ports claimed to carry the canopy over the King and to have the same, with the staves and bells, for their fees, and to dine in the hall on the King's right hand.—Allowed.' Record of the Court of Claims, the 1st of James the Second, Sandford. 'The Dean and Chapter counterclaimed for these fees—the fees referred to the King's pleasure,' *ib.*

²³ Claims, Richard the Second.

²⁴ Claims, Edward the Sixth. 'The Mayor and Burgesses of Oxford by charter claimed to serve in the office of butlership to the King with the citizens of London, with all fees thereunto belonging.—Allowed; and to have three maple cups for their fee; and also, *ex gratia regis*, a large gilt bowl and cover, of 110 ozs.' Claims, James the Second.

tance to present two falcons to the King. The original grant seems to have been by Henry the Fourth to Henry, Earl of Northumberland. There is an admission of the claim at Charles the Second's coronation. At the coronation of George the Fourth, 'amongst the feudal services, the two falcons of Lord Derby for the Isle of Man were conspicuous. . . . The King descended from his chair of state, and the ladies of the Court pressed round to caress and examine the noble birds.'²⁶ According to the tenure of the manor of Nether Bilsington, in Kent, the lord must give three maple cups to the King at the banquet. This tenure dates from Henry the First.²⁷ The manor of Heydon, in Essex, is held by the service of presenting the towel to the King when washing before the banquet. The service can be traced back to the Picot family, in the reign of Henry the Second. 'Petrus Picot tenet dimid' Heydene per serjantiam serviendi cum una toalia ad coronationem regis.'²⁸ Another service dating from Henry the Second is attached to the manor of Liston, in Essex. The service consists in making wafers, which the lord of the manor must bring in person to the King and Queen at the banqueting table.²⁹ The manor of Addington, in Surrey, was granted by William the First to Tezelin, the King's cook, upon the service of making a dish, called, variously, grout or dilligrout, in the King's kitchen. The service has survived to the present time; but as the lord of Addington is no longer the King's master-cook, a division of labour takes place; the King's cook prepares the dish, and the lord of the manor serves it to the King.³⁰

Various offices of state at coronations are matter of tenure by Grand Serjeantry, but many have become extinct. The Grand Almoner of England is an office attached to the barony of Bedford. The Chief Butler at a coronation is the Duke of Norfolk. The Chief Cupbearer is the lord, for the time being, of the manor of Great Wimondley, in Hertfordshire: the original grant was by William the First to Fitzteck the Norman. The manor has become split up by frequent failures of male issue; but the office was claimed, and the right of the claimant admitted by the Court in 1821.³¹

As there was more coil about dispensing with these services than about anything else on the last two occasions, they have been placed

²⁶ *Annual Register*, 1821, p. 344; see also Seldeff. Sovereignty of the Island passed to the Crown, by 5 Geo. III. cap. 26.

²⁷ These are the cups which the Mayor of Oxford receives.

²⁸ *Lib. Rub. Soaco*. 137. Taylor, p. 145; *Temp. Geo. IV.*, Peter Soame, Esq.

²⁹ *Temp. Geo. IV.*, W. Campbell, Esq.

³⁰ 'The grouts are to be boiled in water, . . . when they become soft, mace, wine, sugar, and currants are to be added. It is then usually served up in a bowl, with a toast laid round it, cut in narrow pieces.'—*Account of Coronation of George the Third*, Richard Thompson, 1820, p. 64. Lysons suggests:—'It was called a pottage, and consisted of almond, mylk, the brawn of capons, sugar and spices, chicken parboiled and chopped &c.'—*Enviions of London*, i. p. 6.

³¹ William Wilshire, Esq.

in the forefront of the argument; but it will not be supposed that the case for retaining the procession and banquet rests with these services alone. The procession and banquet are themselves full of antiquarian interest: they are as old as the religious ceremony in the Abbey, and they too have a ritual of their own, of an antiquity which has no parallel in Europe. But pageants and banquets do not readily lend themselves to a general and impersonal description; besides, in any case, space forbids. It will probably be sufficient for the present purpose to state that, according to precedent, the procession moves from Westminster Hall, through the New Palace Yard, to the west door of the Collegiate Church. The persons who compose it walk on a raised platform covered with blue cloth, which extends from the steps in the hall and to the foot of the steps in the choir. The platform is railed in on both sides and protected by troops. The recession is also along the platform to Westminster Hall, where the banquet takes place the same evening.³²

It is, unfortunately, quite impossible to maintain that the revival of these two ceremonies will enable a military pageant to be dispensed with. The route of the historical procession from Westminster Hall passes along a fairly wide open space; but the area is wholly insufficient to accommodate anything like a reasonable number of the general public; while to include a cavalcade of the necessary kind in the already lengthy programme would be to make the full ceremony far too fatiguing for those principally concerned. Why not, then, revive the once invariable custom of going in procession through the City on the day preceding the coronation?³³ This almost unrivalled historical pageant was abandoned when the plague made its appearance in London. It took place for the last time at the restoration of Charles the Second.³⁴ Popularity was then the first consideration; but the City was considered far too unhealthy to be safe, and the proceeding was regarded as courting favour by tempting Providence. Contemporary historians give most charming and detailed accounts of these street pageants, for 'the passing through the City in grand cavalcade, from the Tower to Westminster, the day preceding the coronation, was a spectacle so grateful to the people that it was not omitted anciently except for very cogent reasons.'³⁵

³² For general accounts of the procession and banquet, see Taylor, *Glories of Regality*, 1820; *Chapters on Coronations*, 1838; Planché, *Regal Records*, 1838; *Hist. Account of Ancient and Modern Coronations*, Banks, 1820 &c. The Coronation service of Queen Victoria is reprinted in an Appendix to *Phil. Eco. Law*, vol. i. The only feudal services then performed are given in the rubrics.

³³ For detailed and even tedious accounts of these pageants, see Holinshed, *passim*.

³⁴ See Ogilvy, *Coronation of Charles II.* Similar cavalcades constituted one of the chief features of the coronation of French sovereigns.

³⁵ Planché, p. 49. Also see Wm. Jones, *Crowns and Coronations*, p. 141.

The morrow followyng beyng Saterdaie, his grace with the quene departed from the Tower through the citi of London, agaynst whose comming, the streates where his grace should passe were hanged with tapistrie and clothe of arras. And the greates parte of the southe side of Chepe with clothe of gold, and some parte of Cornhill also. And the streates railed and barred on the one side, from ouer agaynst Grace church unto Bredstreate in Chepeside, where euery occupation stode in their liveryes in ordre, beginnyng with base and meane occupacions, and so assendyng to the worshipfull craftes: highest and lastly stode the maior with the aldermen. The goldsmithes stales unto the ende of the olde Change beeing replenshed with virgins in white, with branches of white waxe: the priestes and clerkes in riche copes with crosses and censers of silver, with censyng his grace and the quene also as they passed. . . . His grace ware in his upperst apparell a robe of crimosyn velvet furred with armyns, his jacket or cote of raised gold, the placard embrowered with diamondes, rubies, emerandes, greates pearles, and other riche stones, a great banderike about his necke of greates balases: the trapper of his horse damaske gold with a depe purfell of armyns. . . . The quene in her litter . . . was appareled in white satyn embrowered, her heire hanging doun to her backe of a very great length, bewtefull to behold, and on her head a coronall set with many riche orient stones. . . . The morowe folowyng beyng Sondaie, and also Midsomer daie, this noble prince with his quene, at time convenient, under their canopies borne by the barons of the five ports went from the saied palaice to Westminster abbey upon clothe called vulgarly clothe of ray. . . .

The above extract is from Hall's account of the coronation of Henry the Eighth. Similar ceremonies took place on the accession of Edward the Sixth; why should not the same procedure characterise the coronation ceremonies of Edward the Seventh? If the suggested cavalcade took place on the previous day, the coronation proceedings would certainly occupy less time than it would be necessary to allot to them, if they included a street pageant like the one which took place at the coronation of Queen Victoria; and the whole function would be far less fatiguing. This is a point worth consideration. It may be noted incidentally that this ancient cavalcade from the Tower represented the formal assumption of *de facto* sovereignty. The actual coronation, though adding to the sanctity of the King, so far from adding to his temporal powers, constituted in effect a surrender of some of them to the people. However, the historical significance of the particular pageant is scarcely relevant to the question. It will probably be sufficient to have shown that there is plenty of precedent for it; and that the cavalcade certainly appears possessed of merits of its own, besides removing all substantial objections to a restitution of the omitted ceremonies on the day of coronation.

It is unfortunately beyond the scope of an article to further elaborate the case for the restitution of these ceremonies. It has, however, been possible to draw attention to points not merely of intrinsic, but of extrinsic interest, connected with the procession and banquet; and to show that doing away with them not only means the extinction of most venerable and interesting customs, but actually touches and concerns a large number of anciently vested

claims and privileges. It is to be hoped that those directly affected will bestir themselves in the matter. If the authorities of Lincolnshire, for example, are concerned with the preservation of county antiquities, let them look to that gem of feudalism which appertains to the manor of Scrivelsby. If mediæval ruins must be preserved at all costs, why not customs of the eleventh century? The privileges of his barons, as conferred by ancient charter, are here commended to the attention of the Warden of the Cinque Ports. If these do not merit preservation, upon what principle are the Warden and Walmer Castle retained? Such customs as these are well calculated in their own small way to contribute to the solidarity of an historical, but very limited and not inexpensive, monarchy. These touches of ancient custom make the sovereign kin with his subjects. So much that seems solidly established to-day has for its chief and only foundation its own historical connections with the past; and it is a rash thing, seeing that the facts are so, to lightly advocate the snapping of historical links, however slender. *

One way or another, it is certain that a decision must very soon be arrived at; for all coronation ceremonies require long preparation and careful rehearsal.³⁶ If public opinion were to pronounce decidedly in favour of reviving the ancient ceremonies, the matter would be settled. This is perhaps too much to expect under the circumstances; but it may reasonably be hoped that the question will be sufficiently discussed in public to secure due attention from the King's advisers.

. . . , L. W. VERNON HARCOURT.

³⁶ True, even for the last coronation. In spite of the many glowing descriptions of that event, it is well known that no one knew their parts, and that *contretemps* of all descriptions were numerous. On the other hand, it is to be hoped that such ceremonies as throwing coronation medals during the service in the Abbey will be omitted: they lead to scenes which are far from edifying.

THREE SCENES FROM M. ROSTAND'S
'L'AIGLON'

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH VERSE BY EARL COWPER

IN offering for publication these rather free translations from M. Rostand's *L'Aiglon*, I need do little more than express my admiration for the original, and give a slight explanation of the scenes which I have selected as illustrations of its power. If by means of these extracts I succeed in sending any readers hitherto unacquainted with it to the play itself, I shall have attained my object.

The scene is laid at Vienna in 1830-32, shortly after the Revolution of July had placed Louis Philippe upon the French throne, and when there was a strong feeling for Napoleon throughout the whole of France. Napoleon's son, the young Duc de Reichstadt, aged twenty, is living at the Austrian Court with his mother and his grandfather, the Emperor, treated with all the distinction due to a Prince of the Blood, but in reality a prisoner, guarded at a distance, and surrounded by spies. Every care has been taken to keep him in ignorance of everything connected with his father, but this father, whom he can just remember, is the one idol of his fancy, and he has managed to make himself acquainted with every incident in his career. Combining in his person some traces of the genius or, at all events, of the great and restless spirit of the French hero with the brooding melancholy of the House of Austria, shattered and embittered by his circumstances, and in an advanced stage of consumption, Reichstadt appears as the Hamlet of this tragedy, but with sufficient difference to make him a distinct creation. Metternich, the all-powerful Minister, is holding him, as it were, in a leash to keep a control over the French Government. The Duke is surrounded not only by Austrian spies, but also by French conspirators, who are constantly urging him to appear in France and proclaim himself Emperor. At last he consents and steals away with a few friends, but is overtaken on the plain of Wagram.

I need not attempt to give even an outline of the plot. The first of the three scenes I have chosen is where Metternich pays Reichstadt a surprise visit in the night and finds him dressed up like his father, with all appropriate surroundings. He is at first altogether taken aback, but recovers himself, and, seeing his opportunity, attempts, not without success, to break the poor boy's spirit by a pitiless exposure of all the faults and weaknesses of the unhappy Hapsburg race, and by pointing out in the glass his unmistakable likeness to these maternal ancestors.

My next scene is at a masked ball on the eve of the flight, and when all has been prepared. It shows how completely the arts of Metternich have for the moment succeeded. It has a strong Byronic touch about it which is appropriate to the time, and gives a vivid picture of an impetuous and reckless spirit, ready to seek refuge from despair by plunging into all the excesses of dissipation.

The last scene that I have attempted is after the conspirators have been caught on the plain of Wagram, and captured or dispersed. As the horses are taken away, and as his own regiment has accidentally been ordered to drill in the early morning at that very spot, the police at his request leave him alone with Flambeau, an old soldier of Napoleon's army, who is one of the leading characters in the play, and has accompanied him in his flight. Flambeau has stabbed himself to avoid being taken, and the Duke is more than half delirious. This weird delineation of the varied fancies suggested to his disordered mind by the associations of the place are among the finest things in the play, and they enable the author to complete his splendid presentation of a most interesting and touching character.

I will only add one word as to my own translation. I have attempted to give the spirit rather than the letter of the original. As to versification I have in the main taken Dryden for my model, but I have ventured occasionally to adopt the French style of running the couplets into one another, in hopes of giving greater variety and rapidity than I could otherwise do. I am well aware that any emotion which may be excited in the reader by my verses will be from the thoughts, rather than the expression, and the thoughts are those of M. Rostand.

ACT III. SCENE 10

Metternich. You're not Napoleon.

The Duke.

What is that you said?

Metternich. You have the little hat, but not the head.

The Duke. You still can find the bitter words that kill

All generous feeling. Banter as you will,
Your taunts are not the dagger's point that brings
Destruction—but the exciting whip that stings

To further effort. I have got the hat
But not the head, you say. 'How know you that?

Metternich. Look in the glass. Come here, that you may trace
The melancholy length of your poor face,
That poor pale face, so heavy yet so fair
With its light yellow self-accusing hair.
The fogs of Germany around you roll
And Spain itself is in your slumbering soul,
So proud, so sad, so charming.

The Duke. No! Ah! No!
Your words are torture—but it is not so.

Metternich. Think of your wavering, contemplative mind.
You fit to govern! Gentle, good and kind
Self-questioner! A king one must tie down
For fear that he should throw away his crown.

The Duke. No! No!

Metternich. No vigour in that forehead there,
But mere homesickness, weakness, and despair.

The Duke. My forehead?

Metternich. And the hand with which you hid
That forehead! Like a prince's in Madrid!

The Duke. My hand?

Metternich. Behold these fingers. Poor limp things.
Shown in so many portraits of old kings
Unused to Labour and adorned with rings.
Your eyes!

The Duke. My eyes!

Metternich. Your ancestors look down
From every wall with eyes just like your own.
Still dreaming of the faggot and the stake,
Still weeping for the wars they could not make.
Look at those eyes, most conscientious Man,
Then go to France as Emperor if you can.

The Duke. But my dead Sire?

Metternich. You've nothing of your Sire?
Come to the glass and look. Draw nigh! Draw nigher!
The Robber thought to make his blood more old
By stealing ours—but only got the cold
Black melancholy of a worn-out race.

The Duke. Hold, for God's sake.

Metternich. See! see! that livid face,
And that large Austrian lip we know so well
Which France associates with the head that fell,
The fair proud head. Ah! they who take the blue
Old Hapsburg blood must take misfortune too.

Moss light!

Metternich. In this glass you find
Yourself in front, and all your race behind.
See the dark outline of poor Mad Queen Jane.
See that pale shade behind the coffin's pane,
A king as pale as you.

The Duke. This face of mine
Shows the clear pallor of a mightier line.

Metternich. See the first Rudolph.

The Duke. Ha! To horse! away!
'Tis the First Consul calls us to the fray.

Metternich. In the dark vault he makes his chemic gold.

The Duke. Makes in the field his glory as of old.

Metternich. See Charles the spectre with the close-cropt head
In horror of his own mock funeral dead.

The Duke. Help, Father!

Metternich. See the black Escorial lowers!

The Duke. Help, Palaces of France! Bright joyous towers
Of Compiègne—Malmaison!

Metternich. They come! They come!

The Duke. Drum of Arcola strike this jabberer dumb!

Metternich. The glass is full!

The Duke. Ho! Victory and Renown,
See the Gold Eagle bears the black one down!

Metternich. Dead is the Eagle—Broken is the Drum,
The glass is full, but still they come, they come,
The Hapsburgs, and they all resemble thee.

The Duke. I'll break the glass. 'Tis broken, I am free!
I wake. The ghosts have vanished.

Metternich. All but one!

The Duke. Not me! Not me! Napoleon, save thy son!

ACT IV. SCENE 4.

Prokesch. Why so depress'd when all are gay? I fear
The blighting hand of Metternich is here.
The plot goes well. You have receiv'd the note
'The violet mantle over the white coat'?

The Duke. Yes, from a lady. This is just the kind
Of safe adventure suited to my mind.

Prokesch. But then the plot?

The Duke. O never, never name
That plot in future. 'Twere indeed a shame,
My glorious country! on thy throne to see
A lump of sorrow and disgrace like me,
Black as the black Escorial. Should I dare
In some wild moment to install me there,

The hideous Past would vomit forth its dead.
 Some Rudolph or some Philip would instead.
 Of your Napoleon come to life in me,
 Beneath the mantle of the Imperial bee.

Prokesch. Your Highness! This is madness.

The Duke.

Think you so?

Each in their gloomy castles long ago,
 Castilian or Bohemian, you will find
 My ancestors had something of the kind.
 Some all night long stood gazing at the sky
 To read their fortune. Some did naught but try
 To catch small birds. Some mutter'd prayers and told
 Their beads. And some attempted to make gold.

Prokesch. Ah! Now the tricks of Metternich are plain:
 You've got the wretched Hapsburgs on your brain.

The Duke. Their madness was too sad. But if 'tis true
 Old perfumes mingled oft give birth to new,
 From these old brains may be distill'd to-day
 Some subtler essence, fiercer but more gay.
 What madness shall be mine? Within my breast
 A stifled flame which I have long suppressed
 At once gives answer. Yes—I burn, I burn
 With love's devouring passion and I yearn
 To crush by kissing this large lip of mine,
 Detested mark of a detested line.

For, after all, consider it with care,
 The true Don Juan is Napoleon's heir;
 The same wild heart that cannot have its fill
 Of conquest, but is discontented still.
 O glorious blood! Corrupted as thou art,
 Too feeble to support a Cæsar's part,
 Thine energy is not too wholly dead
 To furnish a Don Juan in his stead.
 I still may be a Victor of a kind,
 May still distract this fever of the mind
 That eats away my life. May still aspire
 To be a weak reflection of my sire.
 And men who ought to know have prized above
 The whole world's conquest, one wild hour of love.
 A pretty ending to a tale begun
 By such a father!—fifish'd by his son!
 Man after man, he triumph'd o'er them all,
 And woman after woman now shall fall
 Before his offspring. Tho' the sun is set
 Of Austerlitz, we have the moonlight yet.

1901 THREE SCENES FROM M. ROSTAND'S 'L'AIGLON' 903

Prokesch. Stop, if you hold your reputation dear!
Such jesting is too horrible to hear.

The Duke. Yes! I know well. I see a spectre rise
With torn and soil'd blue coat, and thus he cries:
'Then all the glory of the Imperial reign,
Our sufferings and our triumphs are in vain;
The freezing snow—the blood so freely shed—
The countless victories and the heaps of dead
Are all for this—to help you to take in
Some luckless woman that you hope to win.'
I'll wear a Jena feather when I ride,
I'll call the prancing steed which I bestride
Eckmuhl or Austerlitz. And I am told
That as a pin an Eagle made of gold
Adorns a necktie and attracts the fair.
Now let us join the dance! Not Caesar's heir,
Mozart's Don Juan! Or, is this too grand?—
Then not Mozart but Strauss! I hear the band.
'I know I'm charming, tho' of little good.
And valse divinely as an Austrian should.
Ha! My dear Aunt!

Prokesch. At least not that! Forbear!
I fear his eyes. Heaven help him, how they glare!

ACT V., SCENE 5

WAGRAM

The Duke, half delirious, has been left alone with Flambeau, who has stabbed himself to avoid being taken, and is dying.

Flambeau. Here, where I once fell fighting for the sire,
In the son's service I at last expire.

The Duke. Not for the son, but for the sire you die;
I am not worthy—no, not I, not I.

Flambeau. For him?

The Duke. Yes, him; for is not this the plain
Of Wagram, and upon the hill the vane
Of the tall steeple glitters? Look around,
This is the field of battle, and the ground
Still shakes with its intoxicating sound.

Flambeau. The battle?

The Duke.

Don't you hear the mingled cry?

Flambeau. Yes! yes! It is at Wagram that I die.

The Duke. See the wild steed that drags his rider past:
We are at Wagram. Davoust launch'd at last

To turn the flank of Neusiedel—there stands
Napoleon, and his glass is in his hands.

You're wounded by a bayonet in the breast.

Flambeau. Have the Light Horse charged yet?

The Duke.

Along the West

You see the skirmishers, a faint blue cloud.

But ha! what's this? They should not be allow'd,

To turn our left.

Flambeau. He knows what he's about,

The little scoundrel.

The Duke. Ha! they come. A shout

Far off proclaims Macdonald's swift approach,

And Massena comes wounded in his coach.

Flambeau. Is the Archduke extending to his right?

If so he's done for.

The Duke. Auersperg in flight

Rides for his life. Ha! Prince, you must ride hard.

He's taken by the Lancers of the Guard.

Flambeau. What of the Emperor?

The Duke. Sitting with his eye

Glued to his glass.

Flambeau. And will th' Archduke fight shy,

Or is he trapped?

The Duke. Nansouti comes in sight.

Flambeau. Is the Archduke extending to his right?

The Duke. Ah! see that smoke and hear that rumbling. Look
How Lauriston advances!

Flambeau. But th' Archduke?

The Duke. Th' Archduke extends his fight.

Flambeau. (Th' Archduke is done.)

The Duke. I see a hundred guns, and every gun
Goes at a gallop.

Flambeau. Help! I choke! I die!

Drink, drink! The Emperor?

The Duke. Lifts his arm on high.

Flambeau. Then we have conquered.

The Duke. *Flambeau!* Not a sound!

This soldier here extended on the ground
Makes my blood curdle. But I need not fear
At Wagram that a Frenchman should appear,
And the blue coat is not incongruous here.
Yes, Flambeau! Victory! Shakos in the air!

Flambeau. Drink! Drink!

Voices.

Drink! Drink!

The Duke.

Oh God! those echoes there!

Flambeau. I die!

The Duke.

His cries of pain

Come back from every corner of the plain.
Alas! This valley knows those cries by heart,
And the familiar song, when once you start
The leading verse, without an effort goes,
Monotonously droning to its close.

Voices. Oh! Oh! Help! Help!

The Duke.

This is indeed the plain

Of Wagram with its memories of the slain;
And Flambeau moves no more, and I must fly.
This is indeed the grim reality
Of Battle. Poor blue coat, all stained with gore.
Another! Others! Aye, a hundred more!
In vain I fly, in vain I turn. I tread
Each moment on the dying and the dead.
And still I hear that horrible, dull cry
Of agony, 'Help! Help! I die! I die!'
Ah! once I thought the undulating plain
Could keep the hideous secret of its slain,
But back they come, a grim and ghastly horde,
With wounds still bleeding and with speech restored.

Voices. I cannot rise, I'm injured in the head. . . .

My arm is paralysed. . . . my leg is dead. . . .
My breast is crushed. . . . I'm stifling underneath
This heap of bodies and I cannot breathe. . . .
A limb is broken, but I know not which:
Don't leave me here to perish in the ditch.
Lend me a hand. . . . I have no hand to lend,
They both are shattered. . . . Help me to defend
My eyes: they need it, for a carrion crow
Has perch'd beside me and he will not go.

The Duke. Oh, whither shall I fly? The plain is full
Of horrible blood-saturated wool
On which I tread for ever. Oh, the toy
Wood soldiers which I play'd with as a boy!
No eyes had they to pierce me to the bone,
Like these which meet me now. But not unknown
To fame shall be your honourable names.
What did you call yourselves?

Voices.

John . . . William . . . James.

The Duke. And you, pale spectre with the feet that bleed?

Voice. I'm Peter.

The Duke.

Honourable names indeed,

But darkly destined to remain obscure,
Tho' link'd with deeds that shall for aye endure.

Voices. O! put my knapsack underneath my head . . .
I'm bruised and battered by the thundering tread

Of a whole squadron which has laid me low . . .
The crow! the crow!

The Duke.

Ah, nothing but the crow.

Where is the eagle that we held so high?

None names that eagle now.

Voices.

Drink, drink! I die!

Give me the water. 'Tis half blood, but still

Give it me quick, for I must drink my fill . . .

God damn my luck! . . . God help my mother! . . . Here!

For pity's sake, one shot behind the ear.

The Duke. Ah! now I know why I so seldom sleep—

Voice. Those cursed lancers can indeed strike deep—

The Duke. Why all night long incessantly I cough.

Voice. O! that this shattered leg could be torn off.

The Duke. Not without cause I shiver as I sit,

And blood for blood are those dark clots I spit.

They raise their arms, a visionary band,

Hands without fingers, wrists without a hand,

A monstrous harvest which the wind brings home,

And still they seem to curse me as they come.

Forgive me, old dragoon, and wave no more

That mutilated stump all stained with gore;

Forgive me, little conscript of the line,

And fix no more those haggard eyes on mine.

Why creep you thus more nigh and still more nigh?

You draw your breath, what is it you would cry?

A thousand lips unanimously stir, . . .

What is it they would utter?

Voices.

Vive l'Empereur!

The Duke. And is the love of glory then so strong?

And can you pardon this gigantic wrong

Which I must help to expiate? Not in vain

This thin pale shadow moves among the slain:

I come a victim, and can only pray

To be accepted ere I waste away.

Here, while I breathe the mists which round me roll,

With all my body and with all my soul,

I stretch from this red field towards the sky,

And half I feel that I can mount on high,

And half I feel benignant heaven descend,

For thus I deem the Almighty to intend

Till we shall meet and I accepted be

To purify this blood-stain'd victory.

Accept me, Wagram. 'Tis Napoleon's son.

In ransom for so many sons take one.

Amid thy freezing fogs resign'd I stand:

The breath from heaven which gently lifts my hair,
 The very whiteness of the coat I wear,
 The shivering fits which chill me to the bone,
 Mark me as one predestined to atone.
 My mighty sire shall be reproached no more.
 Think of the torments of that lonely shore
 Amid the Atlantic, ye who would assail;
 And Schoenbrunn may be added to the scale.
 But the young eagle who must die anon
 With all the sweet compliance of a swan,
 Who gives his body to be nail'd on high
 To scare the crows and make the vultures fly,
 May ask at least that these dread cries may cease,
 These hideous scenes disturb no more his peace;
 May ask in dying to indulge his pride
 By one brief vision of the glorious side;
 That groans, and shrieks, and curses may be drown'd
 In the stern triumph of the trumpet sound.

Voice. Line will advance.

The Duke. Ha! These victorious cries!

What joy to feel the powder in my eyes!

Voice. Charge!

Duke. How I love the frenzy of the war,

And the wild laughter of the fierce hussar.
 And now, O goddess of a hundred tongues,
 Pour the full volume of thy brazen lungs,
 For near and far and all along the line
 On France, O Victory, thou hast deigned to shine.

Voice. Battalion, halt! Form column!

The Duke. How it stirs

My very heart to hear it!

Voice. Officers

And non-commissioned officers and men.

The Duke. O let me live those moments once again!
 Just one charge more. Sound fife! Wave, banner, wave!
 See the white coats of Austria—charge, ye brave!
 Charge home, my comrades, follow where I lead.
 Over them, through them, this is life indeed,
 The life I've dream'd so often.

Officer. Prince, forbear!

'Tis your own regiment that advances there.

The Duke. 'Tis my own regiment, yes, and from a boy
 I have commanded it. Halt—dress—deploy!

THE EDUCATION BILL

WHEN the present Government came into office in 1895 it was confronted with two educational problems—the one comparatively simple, the other exceedingly complex. In the first place the executive departments responsible to Parliament for the administration of public education needed unification. In the second, for each county and for each borough of any considerable size there was urgently required a paramount Local Education Authority capable of financing, and generally supervising all grades of schools within the area. With a zeal born of youthful vigour the Government tried in 1896 to settle both these problems—and some others—in one great revolutionary measure which was to turn our educational machinery inside out to an extent that had never before been attempted, not even in the year of the great Act. Thanks to his profound ignorance and rooted unconcern for the subject Mr. Arthur Balfour, in the most charming way possible, spoiled the whole design in a complacent endeavour to placate a too importunate follower; and the great attempt of 1896 became abortive much to Sir John Gorst's ill-concealed chagrin. Taught by experience the Government determined to tackle the problem in sections; and it has been continuing the practice ever since. Those who object to the process will do well to remember the attitude they took up in 1896.

As to the unification of the central authorities the Government has succeeded admirably with that comparatively easy problem. In 1899 it passed the Board of Education Act which merged the Education Department and the Science and Art Department in one effective Board of Education; and, what is equally important, secured for that board the assistance of a consultative committee of experts. Already that committee has made rapid strides, as I gather, with the pressing problem of the establishment of a Register of Teachers. So I may with equanimity leave the problem of the Central Executive for public education.

But now as to the problem of the Local Authority. How are we to evolve order and system out of the present bewildering chaos, harmony and accord out of the present discord? From time immemorial we have had scattered all over the country Local Committees of

Management for the Voluntary Schools. These schools still educate 3,043,006 of the 5,705,675 children enrolled in the Elementary Schools of England and Wales; and of the 20,117 Primary Schools in the country under separate management 14,359 are under these more or less non-representative voluntary committees of management. Side by side with these have gone up since 1870 the School Boards. To-day we have in England and Wales 194 Borough School Boards and 2,333 Parish School Boards. All the country boroughs (except Bournemouth, Bury, Chester, Lincoln, Preston, St. Helens, Stockport, and Wigan) and most of the smaller boroughs have their School Boards together, of course with their committees of Voluntary School managers. In the rural areas two-thirds of the country is covered with School Boards; and here again there are side by side with the School Boards the Committees of Voluntary School Management. In the non-School-Board rural areas there are, as will be seen, for the purposes of the local management of primary education only the Committees of Voluntary School Management. As to the effectiveness of these various and too often conflicting agencies, I may say generally that the urban School Boards are exceedingly efficient and have laid the working people of the country under a lasting debt of gratitude for their magnificent efforts on behalf of their children. On the other hand the School Board system in the villages is, generally speaking, thoroughly inefficient. Ignorance, maladministration, and petty personalities are not infrequently its most striking characteristics. With regard to the Voluntary School system of management it is a fair complaint against it that it is non-representative in its character and is very often conducted in a way that leaves the public which finds the funds no local security as to the effectiveness of the education given to the children, or as to the reasonableness of the conditions of service imposed upon the teachers. This state of affairs arises from the stupid anachronism of endeavouring to maintain these schools to such a large extent by means of voluntary subscriptions. That endeavour inflicts great hardship upon the teachers and an inefficient education upon the children; and until it is abandoned the 3,000,000 pupils on the rolls of these schools can never receive the equipment which the struggle before them and their country renders absolutely essential.

So much then for the management of the Primary Schools. Thirteen years ago, however, a new element of confusion was thrust into the arena of local management of public education. The Government had put into its Budget a sum of three-quarters of a million for the purposes of compensating licences hereafter not to be renewed. Its licensing scheme fell through; but the money had been voted. At that moment the great craze was for Technical Instruction; and the few educational enthusiasts in the House of Commons managed to secure that this three-quarters of a million

should be allocated preferentially to the development of this subject. But who was to administer the money in the localities? The School Boards were not universal; and in many cases where they did exist they were confessedly ineffective. On the other hand the country had just been covered, under the Act of 1888, with municipal councils administering suitable areas. So the money was promptly handed over to the new municipal authorities. In the first instance many of them devoted the money, as they are entitled to do, to the relief of the local rates. But one by one they established Technical Instruction Committees; spent this money on the work; and even in some cases went the length of locally rating themselves under the Technical Instruction Act of 1889 which permitted them to lay a rate up to a penny in the pound. To-day most of the county and municipal councils have their Technical Instruction Committees, and, as a matter of fact, of the total sum—867,000*l.*—sent down to the councils last year under the scheme originated in 1889 no smaller amount than 804,000*l.* was applied to technical and secondary education. This investing of the municipal councils with educational administration was the beginning of a great movement. It started the trend of public opinion in the direction of the municipalisation of the control of education; and it is to this policy that the present Government has been emphatically committed from the very beginning.

Now each of these independent local authorities, the School Boards, the Committees of Voluntary School Management, and the Technical Instruction Committee, pegs away industriously, and each on its own lines. Consequently we get overlapping, waste of money and educational effort, and no little friction respecting disputed territories. Clearly then what is needed is a statesman with a head big enough to sweep all this hotch-potch away, and give us, as I have already said, in each locality of suitable area one paramount authority responsible to the people and supervising all the grades of schools within its area. And not only is this desirable in the interests of efficiency and economy. It is absolutely essential if we are to develop for the well-being of his time and generation the faculties of the child of exceptional capacity who happens to be of humble extraction. If such an one is to move uninterruptedly from school to school picking up the threads of his knowledge in the new school at the point at which he dropped them in the old, the schools must be organically linked together, their curricula harmonised, the one in effect something in the nature of a telescopic development of the other. There is absolutely only one way in which this can be effectively secured; and that is by putting the whole of the various grades of schools under one and the same authority in each locality.

When Sir John Gorst began his speech on Tuesday, the 7th of

May, on the first reading of his Education Bill, I thought that his scheme proposed to give us this consummation; and no doubt it is the ultimate intention of the Government to so far extend its present scheme, perhaps in two or three years' time, as to give what I have desiderated. But as the Bill at present stands it cannot secure this end because it does not in any way touch the Primary Schools—except in the matter of the questions raised by the Cockerton Judgment, which I will deal with hereafter. Besides, with so many of the Government's supporters hostile to any connection between Primary and Secondary Education it is distinctly dangerous to create separate authorities. They might crystallise in that form. The Bill, of course, follows the 1896 scheme of municipalising education in the constitution of the new local education authorities which are to be. These authorities are simply the Technical Instruction Committees already in existence furbished up like the Thames steamboats with a new coat of paint and made to look like something very imposing and very effective. The council of every county and county borough is to have an Education Committee. That committee must have a majority of its members, members of the parent municipal councils. As for the rest, the items in the make-up will be determined by scheme which must be approved by the Board of Education. This is a little shadowy, and ought to be filled in by the incorporation of the admirable proposals for the constitution of such a composite municipal local authority set forth in the recommendations of the Rural Commission on Secondary Education.

But there is a previous question. In his first-reading speech Sir John Gorst was all for elasticity and local option in the matter of the constitution of these new local education authorities. That being so I suggest that if the municipal council of any borough, so far from desiring to take on new educational functions, wishes to divest itself of those which it already possesses, and with the approval of the ratepayers appeals for an education authority elected *ad hoc*, the Bill ought to make such provision as would render this possible. Otherwise the system of Local Option is like the Local Option Drink Bill of 1894, only partial in its application.

Remembering the uproar which the non-county boroughs and urban districts made in 1896 when they were told they would not be granted autonomy, but would be ruled by the county council from the county centre, Sir John Gorst has put an ingenious spoke into their wheel. They may have an Education Committee of their own under this Bill. But if they do they will have to rate themselves an extra penny in the pound. Obviously the very ingenious Sir John Gorst does not anticipate that the privilege will be largely utilised. Otherwise his scheme of paramount authorities, which is, in essence, applicable only to the sixty counties and sixty-one

county boroughs, would find itself extended to no fewer than 1,780 local centres. And what that would mean he himself told us in 1896.

Turning to the finance of the Bill it will be observed that the new authority is to have all the Local Taxation Residue money—of which I have already said a great proportion is at present devoted to technical education. It is to have also the right to lay a rate not exceeding 2*d.* in the pound for the purpose of its administration. If the new authority is meant to do any effective work at all, these financial proposals are simply grotesque. Surely the question of the amount of the rating must be left to the ratepayers themselves. And surely the nation which can gaily run up its normal expenditure from 93,918,000*l.* in 1895 to 122,732,000*l.* in 1902—to say nothing of the 153,000,000*l.* which the war has cost up to date—cannot afford to haggle over a few pence for education. If it does it will remain a sort of Tom Sayers among the people of the world, spilling its blood and lavishing its substance to fight for and open new markets in order that they may be enjoyed by its more highly intellectually equipped competitors!

So far, then, I make these three points against the Bill:

- (1) That it does not give a locality the right to have an *ad hoc* authority for education if it desires the same.
- (2) That by keeping the control of primary education apart from the control of secondary and technical education it adds confusion to chaos, multiplies the means of overlapping and extravagance, and does nothing to reduce local friction and animosities; and
- (3) That in its financial proposals it ludicrously underestimates the vital importance to the people of this country of education as a means of national defence and commercial advancement.

But the Bill, it should be understood, has another and extraneous feature altogether. That is to say, it proposes to deal with what is known as the 'Cockerton Judgment.' Shortly to describe the situation created by that judgment, I may say that soon after the passing of the Act of 1870 School Boards, under the pressure of the shrewder and more far-seeing of the artisans for whose children they sought to make provision, were compelled to offer facilities for instruction beyond the Standards of the Elementary Code to such children as were permitted to remain a year or two beyond the normal limit of school life. This initiation of 'Higher Grade' work in connection with our elementary school system, commenced many years ago, has flourished exceedingly ever since, and has undoubtedly been encouraged by all the parliamentary and permanent heads of the Education Office. Recently, however, objection has been taken at a Local Government Board audit of the

these subjects. And Mr. Cockerton, the Local Government Board auditor, has surcharged certain members of the School Board who have signed cheques making provision for this instruction. The School Board has appealed both in the Court of the Queen's Bench and in the Court of Appeal against the surcharge; but in both cases Mr. Cockerton has been upheld, and the law has been definitely laid down that School Boards cannot spend the rate fund on the instruction of children in the Higher Grade day schools, nor upon the instruction of adults in the night schools. Unless modified by further legislation this judgment will have a disastrous effect upon the advanced work now being prosecuted by the great School Boards, especially so far as Higher Grade day school work is concerned in the North of England, and evening school work is concerned in London. By way of easing the situation the Government has tacked on to this Local Authority Bill a 'Cockerton' clause. That clause proposes to enact that School Boards shall go to the new Education Authority for the right to continue work which has been declared illegal under the Cockerton Judgment. This is a clumsy method of dealing with the problem; and it is open to the possibility that a reactionary municipal council might decline to give its sanction to the continuance of the now 'Cockertonised' work. But even if that calamity were avoided, the Bill does not in any way provide for any possible further developments of this work. School Boards may be by grace of the municipal councils authorised to continue to maintain out of the School Board the 'Cockertonised' work as it stands at the moment of the passing of the Act; but as the Bill is drafted there is absolutely no provision for the admission of a single new pupil to a Higher Grade day school, or the admission of a new pupil to a night school. Surely this is not intended!

Looking at the situation as a whole, and endeavouring to assess quite impartially—for I think I may fairly say that any measure designed to more adequately equip our people for the struggles before them would have my support irrespective of the quarter from which it came—the extent to which the present Bill is likely to meet the educational needs of the country, I am driven back to this conclusion: that it would have been better simply to have given us this session a short enabling Cockerton Bill, leaving over the very difficult problem of the constitution of an effective local authority for the more deliberate consideration of next year. The present session is already far advanced; its work is of an exceptionally heavy character; and if the present Bill is to be got through at all it must necessarily be rushed and closed in a way that will certainly not make for educational harmony and will certainly commit us to provisions which will not tend towards the advancement of popular education along sound and progressive lines.

T. J. MACNAMARA.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

And further we be informed by our Judges that we at no time stand so highly in our Estate Royal as in the times of Parliament wherein we as Head and you as Members are conjoined and knit together into one Body Politick, so as whatsoever offence or injury during that time is offered to the Meanest Member of the House is to be judged as done against our Person and the whole Court of Parliament.

PROBABLY no more emphatic and comprehensive assertion of the dignity of Parliament and the inviolability of the person of its members can be discovered among our national records than this declaration of that great and masterful Prince, Henry the Eighth. Made in response to a remonstrance of the Commons against the arrest of a member during the session of Parliament by an officer of the Courts of Law, the significance of the declaration is enhanced when one reflects that it was made at an epoch when Parliament was struggling, with doubtful success, to modify the arbitrary rule of our Tudor Kings.

In reading the history of our country we cannot fail to observe that the sentiment of reverence and affection for the House of Commons has been the abiding characteristic of the English people; and no other nation, ancient or modern, has afforded an illustration of equal continuity in Parliamentary power and prestige.

The status of membership of the House of Commons has been from remote times, and happily continues to be, the highly coveted object of civic ambition. Nor is this so because Parliament is often the avenue to emolument or social distinction. The lawyer, the journalist, and the tradesman may be more or less influenced in seeking a seat by ignoble motives; but a very large preponderance of those who enter Parliament have been solely actuated by a generous desire to serve the State, or at least by the not unworthy motive of wishing to attain the lofty position of statesmen.

A distinguishing characteristic of the House of Commons among the Parliaments of Europe has been the gravity and dignity of its proceedings, not indeed unchequered by occasional outbreaks of disorder, for it is not consistent with the nature of things that men of diverse opinions should meet together to deliberate and legislate on matters upon which they hold profound convictions without passion

sometimes overpowering reason, and hence at all periods of our Parliamentary history there have been occasions of grave disorder. Before the advent of sensational journalism with its grotesque exaggerations there are to be found but few records of disturbance in the House of Commons, and it would appear from the chronicles of early times that it was a point of honour among members not to spread abroad reports of any scandal in the House. We read indeed of a great brawl in the Commons' chamber during the reign of Charles the Second between a certain Lord Cavendish and Sir H. Manmer, both of whom were guilty of extreme violence; but the punishment meted out to them was curiously illustrative of the times in which they lived. The King, much shocked, interdicted them from visiting his Court. During the last century, and long before the advent of those terrible people, the Home Rule Irish, there were many scenes of disorder. Singing, cock-crowing, shouting, and even hissing occasionally desecrated the Chamber.

In comparing the prevalence of disorder in the House of Commons of recent years with what obtained in earlier times, we must not lose sight of the fact that a great change has been wrought in the rules that govern the conduct of members and direct the procedure. The disorderly scenes of recent years almost invariably have been the result of attempts to defy those new rules. •

Until a short time ago the Speaker had no means whatever of enforcing his directions to recalcitrant members. It is true, he could 'name' a member; but we are all familiar with the story how Speaker Onslow, when asked what was the effect of 'naming' a member, replied, 'The Lord only knows.' • In the Commons' Journals of May 1641 and January 1693, we find an entry that 'If Mr. Speaker be compelled to name a member, he will incur the displeasure and censure of the House.' Undoubtedly the House might, of its inherent authority, have passed a resolution suspending, or even expelling, the member; but as a matter of practice, whenever disorder arose and the Speaker's interposition was disregarded, he would content himself with patiently waiting until the disturber of order had become tired or ashamed of his conduct.

There was one Parliamentary condition of former times which greatly tended to the maintenance of order. The House of Commons consisted of only two parties, Whigs and Tories. They were men generally of the same social rank, of congenial tastes, and animated by a strong *esprit de corps*. The opinion of their fellow-members exercised a powerful influence upon the turbulent and unruly, and the natural decorum and dignity of the body of the House were the most effective guarantee against the misconduct of individuals; and, further, that sense of no other restriction save that of being bound by one's own honour exercised a wholesome restraint against intemperance of conduct.

Now, on the other hand, the House is divided into jarring sections. Liberals and Conservatives, while constituting the chief divisions, are sub-divided into Liberal Unionists, Radicals, and the 'Welsh Party,' each of which constitutes a separate entity; while, in addition to these factions, we have the Irish Home Rulers, whom their leader has recently declared to be a 'foreign body.' These different sections owe no allegiance to others than their own particular chieftains, and in some cases the chieftainship is a matter of doubt, and generally of no very high authority. Thus it is that an outbreak of disorder from any one of these factions cannot be readily subdued by the force of opinion.

Again, in former days there was no limit to debate save physical exhaustion or a sense of propriety. Motions for the adjournment of the debate or of the House could be repeated *ad infinitum* for the mere purposes of obstruction; tedious iteration and frivolous divisions were the prerogative of the obstructor; for weary hours long after midnight the House would sit marking time at the inexorable will of a few malcontents; and thus from time to time worked that great weapon of the minority, organised obstruction. And yet somehow this old system, or lack of system—*laissez faire, laissez aller*—worked well enough; somehow or other the House got through its business, great measures of legislation were passed, and the dignity and honour of Parliament were maintained.

It is to the Irish Home Rulers under Mr. Parnell that we owe that great revolution in our rules of procedure and discipline which has been the fruitful source of disorder, culminating in the melancholy scene that marked the first session of a new reign. Mr. Parnell organised obstruction of so persistent and uncompromising a character, that the only alternatives appeared to be the suspension of constitutional government for Ireland or drastic changes in the procedure of the House. The latter alternative as alone practicable was adopted—a series of organic changes in the procedure of the House. Each change justified and necessitated its successor, after a short interval had demonstrated the inefficacy of the one that preceded it to conquer the evil genius of obstruction—limitation of the hours of sitting; the abolition of the power in individual members to make dilatory motions for the adjournment of the House or of the debate; the application of the Closure, a process which Sir Stafford Northcote described as alien to the genius of the British Parliament; the power of the Chair to suspend members who might resist its ruling from the service of the House, succeeded by a rule entitling the Speaker to direct the Sergeant-at-Arms to enforce the order for suspension. Thus the Sergeant-at-Arms—or King's Sergeant, as he was formerly termed—an officer originally appointed to protect Parliament from unlawful intrusion and to enforce its mandates, has now become a peace officer to deal *vi et armis* with unruly members.

These changes, which the House has reluctantly—and, in the judgment of many, not altogether wisely—made under the urgent pressure of Irish obstruction, have been accompanied by an usurpation on the part of the Government of the time of the House which, so far as initiating legislation is concerned, has reduced the private member to impotence and has materially curtailed his opportunities for ventilating public grievances or criticising the estimates. Under Standing Orders the Government is entitled to precedence on considerably less than half the number of days on which the House sits. For some years past they have appropriated quite four-fifths of the session. Thus, at haphazard, I have taken the year 1900; it is typical of the ten years that preceded it. The House sat on 113 days; of these the Government took ninety-one, while under Standing Orders the Government was only entitled to forty-six. It is contended by some that this is for the public good, on the ground that Ministers occupy time which would be frittered away in academic debates by passing useful measures of political and social reform; but those who, like myself, have been at some pains to investigate the history of legislation will find that private members, when they enjoyed a fuller share of Parliamentary time, were instrumental in passing many measures of great practical utility, which, though of modest character and affecting often only limited classes of the population, yet in the aggregate rendered greater public service than the majority of those ostentatious reforms by which successive Governments have endeavoured to secure popularity and power.

The effect of these changes in procedure and discipline, and the curtailment of private members' time, has been to produce almost constant friction between the Government and the minority; but on the part of the Irish members there has been keen and almost incessant resentment. The Closure must of necessity be irritating to a minority strenuously resisting the reading of a Bill or the passing of a vote. The regular Opposition recognise the inexpediency of 'kicking against the pricks,' and content themselves with a courteous protest and a peaceful withdrawal into the division lobby. Not so the Irish members—a storm of objurgations, a refusal to go into the lobby, and at length physical resistance to the mandate of the Speaker!

Unhappily the leadership of the House does not at present tend in the direction of conciliation and harmony. With all his brilliant gifts and personal charm of manner Mr. Balfour is deficient in the capacity to successfully lead the House of Commons. That constant attendance in his place, that keen interest in the debates, that intimate knowledge of procedure and the course of business, that kindly deference to the convenience of the humblest member which so notably distinguished Mr. Gladstone—and indeed in hardly less degree Mr. Disraeli—are conspicuously lacking in Mr. Balfour. But, what is of more moment, Mr. Gladstone was a great Parliamentarian,

inspired with a profound sense of devotion and veneration for that great assembly of which for more than fifty years he was the most distinguished ornament, the depository of its ancient customs and precedents, who imparted, less by the splendour of his eloquence than by the dignity and courtesy of his demeanour, a lofty tone to the House, of which to be a member, he declared, he felt more pride than to be First Minister of the Crown. These things cannot be said of Mr. Balfour. He has produced the impression that he has neither reverence nor affection for the House; although a debater of no mean ability, he apparently never strives to attain to a high ideal of Parliamentary oratory, and occasionally displays a happy ignorance of the course of business which dismays his followers and exasperates the Opposition.

A great Leader plays perhaps a larger part in infusing the spirit of order and discipline among the members of the House of Commons than their chief officer, the Speaker. It is unnecessary to state the qualities that make a great Speaker; but, whatever may be his business capacity, his knowledge of rules and precedents, his readiness in ruling and quickness in transacting business, he is doomed to failure unless he possess a full sense of the dignity of his high office, is in sympathy with the House at large, and gives scrupulous regard to the rights and privileges of all members, irrespective of rank or party. The House of Commons has enjoyed a long succession of great Speakers, and no one who has read the history of the stormy times through which Speakers Brand and Peel held office can fail to admire the equanimity and tact with which those distinguished men fulfilled their difficult duties, and on many occasions thereby preserved the House from outrage and scandal. A notable instance during the Speakership of Lord Peel was the fracas in which certain English members were concerned. The Speaker was summoned by the Chairman, who was impotent to quell the conflict. Mr. Speaker Peel on his entrance resorted to no punitive measures nor personal reproaches; by his dignity of demeanour, by his grave and dignified remonstrance, he recalled the House and every member present to a sense of the folly and turpitude of the proceedings, and thus as it were redeemed the honour and dignity of Parliament.

The deepest humiliation that has ever been imposed upon a legislative body was the entry of police into the House of Commons and the forcible removal by constables of members of the legislature from the Chamber hallowed by the traditions of a thousand years. There is little or no excuse to be urged for the Irish Members in disregarding the authority of the Chair. It may be conceded that Mr. Balfour was tactless in applying the Closure on a vote of 16,000,000L. after only two hours' discussion; some palliation may be urged that the offending members were new to the forms and traditions of the House, and were left without the guidance and

control of their leaders. Nevertheless the absolute authority of the Chair must be maintained, and if defied must be vindicated by exemplary punishment; but the House of Commons is no situation for a free fight, police officers have no place within the chamber of a Parliament, and the authority of the Chair might have been vindicated without the degradation of the House. It has for some years past been the custom of members, whether they vote or no, to vacate the House on a division being called. This is not in pursuance of any Standing Order or rule, but a custom introduced by a late Speaker. Mr. Lowther, the courteous and able Chairman of Committees, did his duty in calling upon the Irish Members to quit the House, and on their refusal reporting them to the Speaker; but I think most people are agreed that it would have been better had the Speaker permitted the division to proceed while they retained their seats, and then have directed the Sergeant-at-Arms not to suffer any of those recalcitrant members to enter the precincts of the House on the following day. He would then have reported their misconduct to the House, and its Leader would have moved a resolution inflicting upon them an exemplary punishment. There is little doubt that the House would have ratified the action of the Speaker and awarded an appropriate penalty.

Had this course been taken, the short-lived and cheap triumph of the Irish members in defying the Speaker would have been more than counterbalanced by the rigour of their punishment, and those who exult in the degradation that has been inflicted upon the legislature by the invasion of the police would have recognised that defiance of the Speaker entailed, not degradation of the House, but the disgrace of the offenders.

Force is no remedy. There is too much reason to fear that this misconduct will be repeated. The other day there appeared in an Irish paper a panegyric upon the evicted members; they had left the House, it said, 'in a blaze of glory.' Is there not serious ground for apprehending that when the session is nearly over, and there is no question of being suspended for any appreciable time from the service of the House, the experiment of defying the Chair will be repeated? Is the Sergeant-at-Arms again to be invoked, the 'Messengers' to be overpowered, the police again to be called in? Is the scene to be further accentuated by increased violence, are we to witness the possible batoning of members of Parliament on the floor of the British House of Commons?

It is to be hoped that the application of actual physical force in the Chamber will never be repeated. All fair-minded men recognise the sudden emergency which confronted the Speaker and the necessity of ready decision; but the sentiments I have here expressed are, I am persuaded, those of the great majority of members. Nothing but the commission of a crime can justify the use of force

in the legislative assembly. Let the inconvenience be what it may, the honour and dignity of Parliament are involved in maintaining the sanctity of its Chamber, even in the face of the greatest provocation.

There is one topic without reference to which this article upon the House of Commons would be incomplete; an idea has become current that the House of Commons has of late suffered diminution of its control over the Executive and is in process of reduction to the status of a mediæval *Parlement de Paris* to register the decrees not of a king but of a cabinet. So long as the House of Commons is elected by the people, controls the national expenditure, and is the principal source from which the Cabinet is created, it will continue the paramount power in the State. While, however, the House of Commons has neither done nor suffered anything that has abridged or curtailed from a constitutional point of view its powers and prerogatives, there can be little doubt that it has sustained a certain measure of disparagement in the public estimation, due in no small degree to a weakening on the part of members in their sense of responsibility for the government of the country, and to an undue submission to the authority of the Cabinet. A recent speech in the House by a son of the Prime Minister has given considerable prominence to this subject, but it is manifestly unfair to attribute to Lord Hugh Cecil's observations upon the decadence of Parliament inspiration from any source other than the academic dialectics from which he has recently emerged.

As I have already indicated, the House of Commons has almost entirely surrendered to the Ministry the control of its legislative functions, while its opportunities for criticism upon the Executive and Administration by the operation of modern rules of procedure have been largely placed at the mercy of Ministers. Against the repressive forces of the Government there is on the part of members no disruptive agency other than actual revolt, but so long as party majorities are on the scale afforded by the elections of 1885, 1886, 1895 and 1900 a Ministry is impregnable against all but the most formidable combination.

Moreover, it is not alone the changed forms of procedure and the happy accident of large majorities that have magnified the influence of the Cabinet. In ante-caucus days the electorate was in virtual ignorance of the meagre legislative policy of the party to which the rival candidates respectively belonged, and that ignorance was usually shared by the candidates, who, subject to a general adherence to the principles of the 'Blues' or the 'Buffs,' were given the widest discretion as to the line of action they should pursue in relation to the policy of Ministers. In these days, on the other hand, legislative programmes extending for fulfilment into distant futurity are laid before the constituencies, and the candidate is elected with what is

termed a 'mandate' to assist his party into carrying out the various schemes of reform which his party leaders had proclaimed their intention to promote. Without, therefore, committing a breach of faith, it is difficult for a member to separate from his party upon their legislative proposals unless indeed, as in the case of Mr. Gladstone's Irish Government Bill of 1886, they be produced without any popular mandate.

But the caucus organisation, in addition to the power it has exercised—more notably, be it observed, in the case of the Liberal party—in constraining political parties to enunciate their legislative programmes, has obtained a controlling influence over constituencies which has resulted in the subjugation of no small proportion of members to their party leaders. The relations between the central party organisation in the metropolis and the local political associations in the various constituencies are intimate, and often there is to be found among the latter in relation to the former a similar subordination to that which obtains between the lodges or branches of a trade union or friendly society and the central governing body. Under such conditions it is not surprising that undeviating obedience to party leaders is sometimes the expressed and often the implied condition if selected as a Parliamentary candidate.

While it is obvious that discipline and subordination are an essential condition of party government, it is clearly fatal to the proper discharge of the representative duty of a member of Parliament that the leader of his political party should be in a position to place before him the alternative of implicit obedience or the forfeiture of his seat, and yet such has undoubtedly been the recent fate of men who had the courage to differ from their party on great questions of public policy.

It is, of course, a moot question whether this new system of delegation or 'mandate' works better for the country than the old system of individual responsibility on the part of members of Parliament; but for the House of Commons it has so far worked ill, independent members of that sturdy type so frequent in days gone by are almost extinct—probably their last survival was Mr. Courtney, who fell a victim to the caucus system—debate on questions of capital importance is now almost confined to the front benches or relegated during the dinner hour to the tender mercies of the least capable but most obtrusive members, and the House of Commons is more attractive to an increasing number of its members as a club than as a legislative assembly.

L. A. ATHERLEY-JONES.

OUR OFFERS TO SURRENDER GIBRALTAR

IN spite of occasional protests against the iniquitous occupation of Gibraltar, the time appears to be far distant when either the British ambassador at Madrid will be directed to exchange the Rock for an equivalent, or when the Cabinet will be recommended by the ambassador to offer to surrender Gibraltar as a means of facilitating negotiations with Spain. Both in England and abroad it seems to be understood that the Rock is as much a part of the British Empire as Portsmouth. Far other was the case for three-quarters of a century after Sir George Rooke captured Gibraltar. There was no clear conception of England as a Mediterranean Power, and Gibraltar itself was feebly garrisoned. Neither the sovereign, nor the Cabinet, nor the British ambassador at Madrid had any continuity of policy in what now appears so important a question: and from each of these three quarters there came, at different times, either offers or actual undertakings to surrender the Rock to Spain.

The first of these offers was made, not as a favour, not as the price of great concessions, but as a bribe to secure the fulfilment by Spain of treaty obligations. The offer was made by England on her knees, and it was haughtily and contemptuously rejected by Spain.

Considering the relative maritime strength of Spain and England, this is an astounding situation. It may be useful to review briefly the events which led up to the rejection by Spain of so favourable an offer.

The war in the course of which Gibraltar was acquired, the War of the Spanish Succession, was brought to a close in the year 1713 by the Treaty of Utrecht. The bloodshed, misery, and expense endured by Europe during the war were so serious that the great Powers were more than anxious to uphold the Treaty of Utrecht as a final settlement of the balance of power, especially of the balance of power in the Mediterranean.

There were signs, however, that one Power—Spain—was endeavouring to modify the existing situation for her own advantage; and in the year 1718 four Powers—England, France, Austria, and Holland—entered into an alliance, known as the Quadruple Alliance, for the purpose of maintaining the Treaty of Utrecht.

It seems an overwhelmingly strong combination, and by the Allies was so estimated. There were only two Powers that were either likely or able to offer resistance to their will, and these were not very formidable Powers; they were the Dukedom of Savoy, not very high up in the list of second-rate States, and Spain, decidedly low down in the list of first-rate States. Accordingly the Allies permitted themselves to use high language. The other Powers were to be given three months' time to join the Quadruple Alliance, and if at the expiration of that period they still declined to join it, the armed forces of the Allies were to be directed to compelling them to do so. In the meantime any attempt to modify the actual situation was to be considered a hostile act, and to be resisted by the united strength of the Allies.

They reckoned without the genius of Cardinal Alberoni, who was at that time Prime Minister of Spain. When the Quadruple Alliance was signed, Spain had twenty-two ships of the line in the Mediterranean, and 30,000 troops with the fleet; she was in actual occupation of Sardinia. Spain, who had long been decried in diplomatic and military circles as 'effete,' once more stood before the world erect, menacing, triumphant. Nor were her Mediterranean successes, great though they were, the principal part of her manifold enterprise. Alberoni aspired to nothing less than universal dominion. His diplomacy, as able as his war administration, had secured a firm alliance with Charles the Twelfth of Sweden, a fighting monarch, who was not scrupulous as to the choice of his enemy so long as he was actively engaged in warfare. Alberoni determined that he should invade England. Russia engaged to supply the ships to convey the Swedish troops, and the Pretender was to land with these strange allies and enforce his claims to the Crown.

In a panic of terror the British ambassador at Madrid offered Gibraltar to Alberoni as an inducement to his master to join the Quadruple Alliance. Nor can he be blamed for making the offer. Spain was already mistress of the Mediterranean. Ships and armies, supplies and money seemed to spring into existence at a wave of Alberoni's wand. England was bewildered at the spectacle of such resources wielded so energetically. The danger in the North was very real. The Cabinet was fully acquainted with the designs of Charles the Twelfth, and had only too good reason for knowing that they were perfectly feasible. The dynasty itself was very insecure; and it was only three years since the Pretender had, without material assistance, convulsed the kingdom. On this occasion he was to repeat the attempt, but supported by Russia and Sweden, at a time when no help could be expected from the Mediterranean fleet, which could with difficulty hold its own in what had now become Spanish waters. No price could have been too high that would have secured the neutrality of Spain: the price actually offered was Gibraltar.

This was at that time the greatest inducement that could possibly have been held out; for although England thought but little of the place, the Spaniards prized it most dearly. Had Alberoni accepted the offer it is almost certain that England could never have become a Mediterranean Power; for the Rock could not have been re-taken if the defences and the garrison received even ordinary attention.

The country was saved from the consequences of its panic by the state of the cardinal's health. Nobody but Alberoni could have lifted unaided the dead weight of Spain; but even on Alberoni that herculean task had told severely. In addition to the labours of the home administration, he had the anxiety of conducting a busy diplomacy over the whole of Europe, and his nerves were in a state of dangerous tension. His sudden and rapid successes and the evident terror with which all Europe regarded him, coming on him while in this overwrought temper, completely intoxicated him. What was the Rock of Gibraltar to a man who held Europe in his grasp? In imagination he saw his nominee, his creature, the Pretender, already enthroned at St. James's. When that was done he would take the Rock of Gibraltar, or anything else that he pleased. England was already on her knees; he would soon make her as one of his master's provinces.

These are the resolutions of a mind that has lost its balance; nevertheless they are the resolutions on which the cardinal acted. He rejected the offer, and continued his career of conquest in the Mediterranean by attacking Sicily. This was exactly the kind of move that had been contemplated by the Quadruple Alliance when it was agreed that any attempt to disturb existing relations should be resisted by the united forces of the Allies. The only one of the Allies who could possibly resent it, however, was England. A British fleet was on the spot, the admiral was Byng, created for his action on this occasion Viscount Torrington. He attacked the Spaniards off Cape Passaro and scattered their fleet; those of their ships that survived the battle fled towards Syracuse. It was on this occasion that Captain Walton, in command of the pursuing squadron, penned the despatch to his chief that has been often cited as a model of brevity:

Sir,—I have taken and burnt, as per margin, going for Syracuse, and am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. WALTON.

This occurred on the 22nd of August 1718. In November the Duke of Savoy deserted his ally, Spain, and joined the Quadruple Alliance. The command of the sea being lost to Spain, the Austrians could pour in the troops set free by their recent successes against the Turks; and Alberoni could not now hope to hold Sardinia and Sicily for long. In the North still worse fortune befell him. On

the 11th of December 1718 Charles the Twelfth of Sweden was killed by a cannon-ball at the siege of Frederickshall. With despairing energy the indomitable cardinal got together and equipped another fleet for the invasion of England. In March 1719 it was scattered by a storm. In April the French, under the leadership of the Duke of Berwick, invaded Spain. The accumulation of disasters destroyed Alberoni's influence. In December 1719 he was dismissed from all his posts, and Spain subsided into the torpor from which the genius of her great minister had dragged her.

Alberoni disappeared from Spanish politics; but the idea of regaining Gibraltar for Spain did not disappear with him. The negotiations prior to the outbreak of war in the year 1718 had shown that, in the modern phrase, England was 'squeezeable' about Gibraltar. The Opposition in Parliament said a great deal about the 'barren rock' and its 'useless charge' to the finances; and continental statesmen, misunderstanding then, as often afterwards, the meaning of the attitude of a constitutional opposition, presumed that they only had to press hard enough, and the Rock would be abandoned.

The Spanish king was a Frenchman; but, following the wise counsels of Louis the Fourteenth, he had made himself a Spaniard of the Spaniards, and he pressed hard for the cession of a place so dear to Spain. He had a good ally in General Stanhope, the British minister at Madrid; but, not content with that, he made use of his family connection with France to engage the regent to support his policy: and the regent's support was, for the moment, fatal to him.

On the 28th of March 1720 Stanhope wrote to Sir Luke Schaub a letter summarising the whole situation. It ran as follows:

We have made a motion in Parliament, relative to the restitution of Gibraltar, to pass a Bill, for the purpose of leaving to the King the power of disposing of that fortress for the advantage of his subjects.

You cannot imagine the ferment which the proposal produced. The public was roused with indignation on the simple suspicion that we should cede that fortress. One circumstance greatly contributed to excite the general indignation—namely, a report insinuated by the Opposition that the King had entered into a formal engagement to restore Gibraltar. . . . We were accordingly compelled to yield to the torrent, and to adopt the wise resolution of withdrawing the motion; because if it had been pressed it would have produced a contrary effect to what is designed, and would perhaps have ended in a Bill which might for ever have tied up the King's hands. Endeavour to explain to the Court of Madrid that if the King of Spain should ever wish at some future day to treat concerning the cession of Gibraltar the only method of succeeding would be to drop the subject for the present. We are much concerned that France should have interfered on this occasion: the extreme eagerness that she testified was of great detriment.

As Stanhope was really anxious for the restitution of Gibraltar, he made a journey to Paris in order to persuade the regent to withdraw his disastrous support: and the regent, who had no desire for a breach with England, did so.

But Spain insisted. The king made a personal matter of it, and a point of conscience. He had announced the impending recovery of the Rock to his subjects; and although England was not bound by so unjustifiable a promise, the declaration raised expectations in the minds of the Spaniards. There arose a public opinion that grew more stubborn and angry as the months went by and the British flag still waved over Gibraltar. Stanhope therefore made a serious effort to get rid of the place. He was now minister in attendance, and the sovereign was in Hanover. On the 1st of October 1720 he wrote a long despatch to England, reviewing the whole European situation and dwelling most emphatically on the importance of the support of Spain and on the great desirability of not allowing the Regent of France to become too intimately allied with the King of Spain. Both these ends would be secured by the cession of Gibraltar. He could not, for reasons which he gave at length, advise the king to surrender Gibraltar for nothing; but if the King of Spain could give either Florida or Hispaniola in exchange, neither of which places was intrinsically valuable or of importance to Spain, either military or commercial, the Ministry would undertake to face Parliament with that proposal, difficult and perhaps dangerous though it might be to do so.

This was the second offer to withdraw from Gibraltar, and it was flatly and impatiently declined.

What stood in the way of the surrender of Gibraltar was the stubborn resolve of this country that the surrender should not be permitted. Nevertheless, so useless was the place considered to be, and so genuinely desirous were the king and his ministers to shake this millstone from off their necks, that Parliament would undoubtedly have been again approached on the subject if Spain had been amenable. But it is hard to say which is the more curious, the conciliatory and almost imploring temper of England in a negotiation of such importance, or the authoritative language of Spain. England only asked a decent pretext for going; but Spain would not be satisfied unless she not only expelled the English but trampled on them.

Long disused as the Spaniards were at this time to the forms of constitutional government, they were probably really unable to understand why a project favoured by the sovereign, supported by his ministers, and strongly recommended by his ambassadors, could not be carried through. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Spain thought she was being trifled with. Whether that was the reason or not, early in the year 1721 her ambassador in London informed the Government that the Court of Madrid was in real difficulty with the Spaniards owing to the long delay in restoring the Rock of Gibraltar, and that they would be much obliged if England would make the offer in writing; it would greatly strengthen their hands, it was added, with some *naïveté*.

Incredible though it may seem, the ministers advised the king to accede to the Spanish request, and on the 29th of April 1721 George the First wrote an autograph letter promising to restore Gibraltar for an equivalent. This was the third offer to restore Gibraltar, and this time the offer was made in writing and over the king's own signature.

The British ambassador at the Court of Madrid presented this extremely compromising letter to the king and queen, who were at the palace of Aranjuez. Very far indeed from being gratified, they said that such a letter was useless to them. Unconditional withdrawal from the fortress was the only undertaking on the part of the King of England that they would be justified in accepting; it was what they were entitled to ask, and the least that would satisfy the Spanish people.

The fourth offer to surrender Gibraltar was therefore made, also in writing, on the 1st of June 1721. The letter was subsequently published in the Commons' Journals; translated it runs thus, as to its material parts:

I do no longer balance to assure your Majesty of my readiness to satisfy you with regard to your demand touching the restitution of Gibraltar, promising to make use of the first favourable opportunity to regulate this article with the assent of my Parliament.

George the First has been much blamed for writing this letter; but there are surely excellent reasons for justifying, and even applauding, his conduct. He was not an Englishman, and could not even speak English. He did not assume the arduous and complicated duties of a constitutional sovereign until late in life, and one of the first duties of a constitutional sovereign—as he was incessantly reminded—was to listen to the advice of his ministers. The blame, if blame there was, must attach to Carteret and Townshend, who advised him.

There is no evidence that the ministers resented the language held by Spain; there is no evidence that they cared anything for Gibraltar, either for itself or for what it might protect; indeed, they maintained that it protected nothing except Minorca, which was quite capable of protecting itself. But if they ever felt that they were dealing somewhat lightly with a weighty matter, they reassured themselves by remembering the clause 'with the assent of my Parliament.' From this point of view the letter, after all, meant no more than that they would take the vote of the House of Commons on the matter; and although for themselves they would have been very glad to get rid of the Rock, yet if it should turn out to be more valuable than they imagined, there was always the way to fall back upon.

The Spanish view was very different. The expression 'with the

assent of my Parliament' conveyed nothing to a king who had no Parliament to consult. The letter was in Spanish eyes a sacred undertaking to evacuate Gibraltar, made on the word of a king; and delay was now nothing less than perfidy. Accordingly Philip, both personally and through his diplomatic agents, pressed eagerly for the immediate surrender. The British ambassador at Madrid early in 1722 wrote home bemoaning his helplessness. 'Gibraltar,' he said, 'barred the way to all useful negotiation.' He offered the suggestion that England might even yet obtain something in exchange. But Philip had from the beginning definitely rejected the idea of an exchange, and it is possible that the ambassador anticipated no result from his despatch. Considering the view of the case that the Spanish king must naturally have taken, he exhibited great patience, and even the somewhat violent language with which he closed his last interview with Stanhope was not inappropriate. 'Immediate restitution or war,' he said. Stanhope pleaded the old excuse about Parliament, and objected that the king was in Hanover. 'Then let the king your master return at once from Hanover, and call Parliament for the purpose.'

This was the last thing that the old king was likely to do, or his Parliament to consent to, and General Stanhope could promise nothing.

The Spanish king, strong in the consciousness of a recently concluded alliance with the Emperor, then determined to take Gibraltar by force. On the 11th of February 1727, trenches were opened; and after much violent language the siege of the Rock was commenced. The garrison held its own without the slightest difficulty. There seems to be some doubt as to whether the Rock is impregnable against modern artillery; but against the weapons of one hundred and seventy years ago, especially such weapons as Spain employed, there was no doubt whatever of the impregnable strength of the Rock. England retained the command of the sea, and easily fed the garrison, which numbered 6,000 men. The siege lasted four months, and was from the beginning—as any expert could have foretold—perfectly futile.

In drawing up the preliminaries of peace after this outbreak, the Cabinet displayed its habitual anxiety to remove the British garrison from the Rock. The following letter from Lord Townshend to Stephen Poyntz, under date 14th June 1728, defines the situation:

What you propose in relation to Gibraltar (that is the unconditional surrender of the Rock) is, certainly, very reasonable, and is exactly conformable to the opinion which you know I have always entertained concerning that place. But you cannot but be sensible of the violent and almost superstitious zeal which has of late prevailed among all parties in this kingdom against any scheme for the restitution of Gibraltar upon any conditions whatsoever; and I am afraid that the bare mention of a proposal which carried the most distant appearance of laying England under an obligation of ever parting with that place, would be sufficient to put the whole nation in a flame.

Here, then, is a complete epitome of the situation. The Ministry and the ambassador not only anxious, but markedly anxious to abandon Gibraltar; the king, as was his duty, showing no decided opinion; and the Commons stubbornly—or, as Townshend, put it, violently and superstitiously—opposed to the idea of withdrawal.

It was rumoured that an understanding on the subject had been secretly entered into by the sovereign. It was this—as became apparent from Stanhope's letter to Sir Luke Schaub—that had caused such general apprehension as long ago as the year 1720, fifteen months before the compromising letter was actually written.

The Opposition now angrily demanded that the king's letter should be tabled, but Walpole demurred on the ground that the sovereign's correspondence was sacred.

The question was repeated early in 1729 in the House of Lords; and as the royal letter had, in the meantime, been published on the Continent, it was difficult to avoid complying with the demand of the Opposition. The letter was tabled; and now, eight years after the fourth offer to surrender Gibraltar had been made, Parliament was at last in possession of the whole case.

It was dealt with promptly and plainly. The least violent of several proposed resolutions was couched in the following terms: 'That the House relies upon His Majesty for preserving his undoubted right to Gibraltar and Minorca.' This was communicated to the Commons, and was ultimately carried, although not until an attempt had been made to carry a resolution calling upon the King of Spain to definitely renounce his claim to both places. The moderation of the Ministry merits recognition. If any such resolution had been carried, a most embarrassing situation might have resulted.

Stanhope was now directed to present himself at the Spanish Court and negotiate a peace. His task was comparatively easy. King Philip had endeavoured to obtain possession of Gibraltar by force, and had failed. The resolutions passed by Lords and Commons showed him plainly enough that he had nothing to expect from the English Parliament; and although keenly resentful of the treatment he had received, he assented to the Treaty of Seville signed on the 9th of November 1730. In this treaty there were no provisions relative to Gibraltar.

Considering the high language that had been held by the King of Spain—for eleven years—ever since the fall of Alberoni in 1719, the omission was held to be equivalent to the tacit abandonment of Spanish claims to the Rock.

The fifth offer to surrender Gibraltar was made in a secret despatch dated the 23rd of August 1757. On this occasion William Pitt directed Sir Benjamin Keene, British ambassador at the Court of Madrid, to offer Gibraltar to Spain as the price of a Spanish alliance to be contracted with the object of wresting Minorca from France. It is

to be remembered that France had, in the preceding year, captured Minorca after a siege of seventy days' duration. Sir Benjamin's comment on this despatch was that Pitt must be mad; but he carried out his instructions, and made the offer, which was promptly rejected.

In contrast with the offers made thirty years before, it was on this occasion the Ministry that proposed the surrender and the ambassador that derided it; whereas in Stanhope's time the ambassador had urged the surrender, and the Cabinet had shown reluctance, fearing the Commons. In spite of a sense of the grandeur and importance of the British Empire (a sense not only actual but prophetic), Pitt now sought to exchange Gibraltar for Minorca. So far was he from fearing that the loss of the Rock would weaken England, that he was fully prepared to employ his great authority in overcoming the resistance of the Commons to his proposal—a resistance that he must have known would be very stubborn. He, the Great Commoner, was perfectly ready to secretly dispose of what the Commons had repeatedly declared to be the most important possession of England, and to defend his action in the House afterwards. Nor is the attitude of Spain less noteworthy. Even after fifty years of alternate menace and negotiation Spain would not admit that Gibraltar was a proper subject for an exchange. Unconditional surrender was now, as before and after, the only offer that Spain would consent to receive.

The sixth and last offer to surrender Gibraltar was made in the year 1783, during the negotiations that preceded the Treaty of Versailles. Lord Shelburne offered Gibraltar to the Spanish ambassador in exchange for Porto Rico in the West Indies. The Spaniard welcomed the prospect of regaining Gibraltar, but did not wish to cede Porto Rico in exchange, nor did he wish to cede any other place. When Shelburne communicated his proposal to his colleagues they were not scandalised; they only said that his offer was too generous, and that England should demand two West Indian islands instead of one, in exchange for a place of such importance as Gibraltar. But if the Spaniards objected to giving up Porto Rico, still more did they object to giving up Porto Rico and Trinidad.

This sixth offer to surrender Gibraltar was made at the time when England was preparing to conclude a humiliating treaty. But on the other hand it was not contended, even at the time, that England had put out her full strength in the War of American Independence. Moreover, it was perfectly well understood that the American campaigns had been from first to last miracles of blundering, and the defeat of England was rather due to that cause than to any overwhelming military superiority on the part of the colonists. The nation was sullen rather than cowed. Moreover, England could claim glories. The English had held their own against the world on the sea; and in particular the defence of Gibraltar had been one of

the most magnificent defences of modern times, and had lasted for three years.

There have, of course, been ministers who were insensible to such considerations; and perhaps Shelburne was one of them. But even if he were he could never have made such an offer, if the maintenance of British power in the Mediterranean had been any part of a traditional English policy. However little the defence of Gibraltar may have appealed to the Cabinet, it stirred the nation to its depths. Shelburne tested the views of the Commons on the subject of the surrender and obtained such unmistakable evidence that his proposal was unpopular that he was constrained to change his attitude. He informed the Spanish ambassador that he would be unable to carry out his plan. The Court of Madrid was most indignant and threatened to renew the war.

Thus once more in the course of the eighteenth century Spain—eager as she was to regain Gibraltar—was yet unwilling to make the slightest concession to obtain her end, and showed herself most indignant that England would not give up the Rock for nothing and consider herself rather honoured than otherwise by the transaction. Shelburne's was the last offer made to surrender the Rock. These repeated offers on England's part to retire are perhaps worthy of attention, for three reasons: firstly, because Gibraltar looms very large before the eyes of the student of the Mediterranean; secondly, because—in so far as a civilian can understand the question—there can be no Mediterranean route to the East without Gibraltar as a starting-point; and thirdly, because in spite of that fact it is not generally known how very carelessly England held this important possession for more than three-quarters of a century after it was acquired.

The conclusions to be drawn from this piece of history are these: The sovereign, as was his duty, held no very strong views on the subject. The Ministry and ambassadors were almost invariably anxious to disembarass British policy by ceding the Rock. Once only in the course of three-quarters of a century of negotiation was the Prime Minister deemed crazy for suggesting the withdrawal of England. Even the great Pitt saw no advantage in maintaining a British garrison in Gibraltar. He and the ministers who were in favour of some other place in the Mediterranean had no idea of the Mediterranean route in their minds. They merely considered that Gibraltar might be useful to England as an offensive outpost; if any other place could be utilised for that purpose, any other place would be preferable. What baffled the plans of ministers and Cabinets for shaking England free of Gibraltar was the stubborn resistance of the people, or, as Townshend expressed it, their 'violent and superstitious zeal.'

WALTER FREWEN LORD.

MR. SARGENT AT THE ROYAL ACADEMY

WHAT is the secret of the weariness, the depression of spirit that follow a visit to the Royal Academy? It is not the number of the pictures. After walking for hours in the National Gallery or the Louvre or the Uffizi Palace you may feel tired in body, and perhaps in mind, but you do not feel depressed in spirit: you feel elevated, exhilarated, braced up. It is not that the average of execution is low. There is a vast amount of cleverness in painting to be noticed; the level of mere executive ability is high. What is it, then? Why, surely this: that the pictures, in spite of being painted with talent, have nothing to say to you; that you come upon scarcely any fresh ideas; that your emotions are unstirred, your mind left vacant, your eyes even unsatisfied. Painting is, after all (or ought to be), a vehicle for the expression of ideas. The mere technical dexterity of brush and palette-knife are but the means, not the end. They are the painter's parts of speech. To knowledge of these a painter who is to win us must add either the profundity of mind that originates ideas or an alert intelligence which picks up the best ideas that are going in its time. A picture that expresses no idea is as wearisome as a babbler who will be talking with nothing worth saying to say. No torment disturbs and harasses the soul more than to be belaboured with empty words and phrases, to undergo a stream of chatter that gives the mind nothing to work upon. There are people, it is true, who can dress up matter of little interest in so attractive a form of words that the charms of the envelope make us forget or overlook the blankness of the sheet enclosed. Just so there are painters who have little to express, but who express it so gracefully that their lack of ideas is gladly forgiven. At the Academy, however, not only have the pictures little or nothing to express; they most of them lack equally any freshness or charm in the manner of expressing it. They are a saddening commentary upon Matthew Arnold's denunciation of our English middle class for (amongst other things) its stunted sense of beauty. They convey no charm. They excite no feeling whatever. They are as commonplace as the mass of the people who trail listlessly before them.

If we adopt this view of the cause that makes the Academy

wearisome, we can make it serve as well to explain a thing that puzzles a number of persons who wish to take an intelligent interest in painting, and this is the supremacy of Mr. Sargent. This year it is less disputable than ever. It is a Sargent year, indeed. His pictures are the only ones that leave a deep impression: among hundreds of meritorious exercises in paint, these stand out with astonishing force and with vivid evidence of a mind fiercely at work. Many people say, 'Now, why are Mr. Sargent's pictures so wonderful? I can't say I like them, and yet'—and yet no one can help feeling their power and their fascination. Why? Why, for the very reason that Mr. Sargent has something to express, that he has something to say to you, that you feel, in front of his work, that your stock of ideas is the larger, that you are looking at something from a fresh point of view. He sees things for himself; his vision is as individual as was the vision of Velasquez. He looks at a figure and he sees in a moment all its harmonies and contrasts of colour, all the play of light and shade upon it, how to express its lines in the most striking manner, how to convey to you the impression which, as a whole, it leaves upon him. More than this, too, for he forms at the same time an impression of character, and he leaves upon the canvas the record of that as well. In his painting he carries realism very far, but it is always subjective and never objective realism. He never tries to paint things exactly as they are by common consent, but exactly as they present themselves to him. He has the intuitive gift which great art always possesses of knowing what to leave out. He chooses the materials for his effect with the same unhesitating swiftness and rightness that characterised Greek art. His convention is scarcely ever at fault. He merges the individual in the universal without apparent effort. The miracle is accomplished to all appearance between one brush-stroke and the next. There is nothing photographic or slavish about realism of this nature, which is, in truth, nothing but the ability to convey impressions with the utmost directness and power. His pictures may give you pleasure or they may not. Of those at the Academy, that of the two ladies—one of his most perfectly painted portraits—a picture that has all the certainty of handling and all the maturity of style of the great English portrait-painters—this one can scarcely be called pleasing. The family groups, on the other hand, may be enjoyed without any awkward feeling of intrusion, without any confused uncertainty as to whether one ought not to murmur an apology and pass discreetly by. He has painted the children in these with far more feeling for the charm of childhood than he showed in his portrait of the little girl with the riding-whip at the New Gallery last year. But, whether they please or do not please, there can be no question that Mr. Sargent's pictures do express ideas.

For a painter to express ideas, however, even though he express them with the greatest possible skill of hand, is not quite enough to make him a great painter. The next question we must ask ourselves is: Does he express noble ideas—ideas that fill us with noble emotions—ideas that are beautiful and serviceable and true? We are not now quite so sure of our ground. There is much that is very beautiful in Mr. Sargent's work—the red velvet robe and the red rose in the Wertheimer portrait, the marvellous painting of detail—tapestry, cabinet, *bric-à-brac*—in the Sitwell group, the lamp in the portrait of Professor Bywater. But do his pictures leave with us the feeling that our range of appreciation has been widened? Do they give us that lasting satisfaction which comes from the contemplation of real forms so treated as to come near to the ideal? Before me as I write there hang six small—quite small—reproductions of famous portraits of women by Reynolds, Romney, Gainsborough, Raeburn, and Lawrence. The delight of these is inexhaustible. No one could grow weary of them. They are a perpetual refreshment. Now, will Mr. Sargent's pictures reproduced small in a hundred years' time give this same sort of pleasure? Do they give it now? For myself I answer: No, they do not. And why do they not? Surely, it can only be because they fall short of our conceptions of the beautiful; because we do not feel in them any striving after an ideal of beauty; because, though they do offer us ideas, they do not offer us the noblest ideas, the ideas that must animate the work of a great painter.

What ought to be the painter's constant aim, if not to interpret to his fellows the forms of Nature and to show their underlying perfection? 'For painting,' wrote Cennino Cennini, 'we must be endowed both with imagination and with skill of hand, so as first to discover unseen things concealed beneath the obscurity of natural objects, and then to arrest them with the hand, presenting to the sight that which before did not appear to exist.' And Ruskin meant just the same thing, though he expressed it less clearly, when he wrote that 'all the noblest pictures . . . are true or inspired ideals, seen in a moment to be ideal; that is to say, the result of all the highest powers of the imagination, engaged in the discovery and apprehension of the purest truths, and having so arranged them as best to show their preciousness and exalt their clearness.' How far are the painters of to-day from realising these precepts! Most are content to offer us the baldest transcripts from Nature. It is well, indeed, if we can recognise in their canvases the works of Nature at all. A painter lacking the sense of beauty has mistaken his craft. His industry is futile, had better have been devoted to some more useful end. And why do the painters of to-day lack the sense of beauty? Because they do not study to steep themselves in beautiful ideas. 'Draw and paint what you see,' cry the false prophets of Art.

feel bewildered and out of their depth. 'O foolish Galatians! who hath bewitched you?' One of the surest signs of greatness in a work of art is that it *shall* bewilder those who look upon it, bewilder them by its suggestion of infinite, undreamed-of possibilities of loveliness. And it is only, by seeking after these possibilities, 'always without intermission either on holidays or weekdays' (to quote the excellent Cennini once more), that 'good practice becomes a second nature,' and the painter's understanding, 'being always accustomed to gather the flowers, would scarcely know how to take the thorns.' Study Bellini's pictures, and you will see how he arrived gradually and painfully, only after toil and tribulation, at the perfect type of Madonna which gladdens life for many of us after all these centuries. He set before himself the ideal of his imagination, but it was long before his skill of hand could carry out exactly the behest of his mind. No doubt there were plenty of cheerful Venetians who said to Bellini, 'Why take so much trouble? Paint what you see.'

Well, you may say, in Bellini's time, in Italy throughout all the fourteenth and fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, life was so fair a thing that all painters had need to do was to paint what they saw. Never believe it. Was there no squalor, no ugliness, no brutality in Venice and Florence, and Siena, and Assisi, when the quattrocentists were covering every church wall with their gracious and beautiful fancies? Read the chroniclers and see. Even such a painter as Carpaccio, who did paint what he saw and whose fascinating interiors (as the bedroom of St. Ursula, the house of the Blessed Virgin, and the study of St. Jerome) tell us, with faithful exactitude what the dwellings of his day were like—even Carpaccio must have selected with infinite pains what he had best leave out. Where did Bellini see the face of the Madonna in the Frari Church at Venice? Where did Della Robbia see the rapt expression of the St. Francis in his exquisite altar-piece in the Convent of the Osservanza near Siena? Where did Beltraccio see the entrancing type of childhood that hangs in the delightful little picture gallery at Bergamo? Of course, they did not see them, they imagined them, and this is what the greatest painters in the world have all done. They have gazed more deeply into the objects they painted than would be possible for the rest of mankind. They have 'discovered unseen things' (of course Cennini meant 'beautiful things') 'concealed beneath the obscurity of natural objects.' They have set down as far as in them lay exact renderings of their ideal forms of beauty. Sometimes they completely failed in one direction. Crivelli's faces are nearly all grotesquely ugly. Luca Signorelli in his figure-drawing seldom hit the happy mean between effort and grace. Mantegna failed again and again to represent horses correctly. But you may see how they strove against their failings and how keen their sense of beauty was. Though they might fall short of achievement, there was never any slackening of effort, never any conscious abandonment of the ideal.

It is just this untiring pursuit of the ideal that is so sadly to seek in the painting of to-day. There seems to be a minimum of mental effort devoted by painters to their work, a sluggish acceptance of the out-sides of things as the only possible concern of the artist. The few who do stand out from amongst the mass in this respect stand out with a distinction which shows at once what a difference an ideal of beauty makes to a painter's work—even though it be an ideal that he shares with but a few. What made Burne-Jones's fame? Simply and solely his unswerving pursuit of his ideals. Whether he was or was not one of the world's great painters, as he certainly was one of the world's greatest masters of design, the future must say. But this is beyond question: that there was in him the same spirit which animates the greatest painters. He had a clear conception of what he considered the beautiful, and he followed it with steadiness of purpose and a wholesome disregard of the opinions of others. Everything he did bore upon it not only the stamp of that sincerity which commands respect and even reverence, but the impress also of a mind given over solely to the search for truth, which is the highest form of beauty, and beauty which is the surest envelope of truth.

Of how many painters can this be said to-day? The most of them float hither and thither, borne about by every wind of popular fancy, every gust of pictorial fashion. Those who pursue the even tenor of some way they have made their own pursue it with a mechanical regularity that is pathetically meaningless from any point of view but the rigidly commercial. The few who paint with their heads and with their hearts, and with understanding of what should be the painter's aim, have to be sought here and there, and win the appreciation of the few only. 'You find them here and there even upon the walls of Burlington House. Mr. Waterhouse never abandons the pursuit of the ideal. Mr. Abbey's *Crusaders* have a light in their eyes that fills the picture with force and meaning; it may be restless in composition, a little hard in colour, too, even allowing for the clear thin air of Palestine, but it tells us what the painter felt. Mr. Ridley Corbet's *Val d'Arno* is full of an ineffable charm, emotional in the right sense. The winning radiance of evening light, the grey solemnity of gathering dusk, the spacious beauty of the plain with its distant, guardant hills, have entered into the artist's soul, and, because he felt deeply, he had the power to communicate his emotion to all capable of sharing it. Mr. Byam Shaw's colour sense may lead him on the right lines; he seems to strive; but he is principally a decorator, and his ideas are not of the first order. Mr. Shannon's *Flower Girl* has beauty and an engaging quality of tenderness. Mr. Clausen's study of dusks and lights has something of the grand style about it. Mr. La Thangue fills and refreshes the eye with his sunlight and open air, but does not paint with any emotional force. In the Sculpture Rooms, amongst a good deal of 'Canoverly,' and many

'staring busts of frightful-featured men,' there are works of real imaginative power, touched with the live coal of ideality—works that invigorate and charm. Such are Mr. Hamo Thorneycroft's Dean Colet group, Mr. Frampton's touching little *Edward the Sixth*, and several less ambitious pieces. Among the little-known exhibitors, too, there are several who seem to understand what the painter and sculptor should strive after, and who are trying to discover unseen beauties beneath the obscurity of natural objects. The light that shines for all who work to this end is not the flickering rushlight of popularity or price, but the fixed star of ideal loveliness which has guided all true followers of art since art was born into the world. They, perhaps, are born out of their time. For all of like mind with them there has been but one country and one period. That country and that period fostered the great line which began with Cimabue, handed on the traditions of its arts throughout three hundred years, and only died away when, in Ruskin's words, 'the sixteenth century closed, like a grave, over the great art of the world.'

Here, then, we have it—that the one thing needed to Mr. Sargent's work, needed to give him a place among those painters who have embodied in their pictures the greatest number of the greatest ideas, is this quality of the ideal—of imagination striving towards the noble and the beautiful, shrinking from the commonplace and from all that is not lovely and of good report. Nor are we left without a gleam of hope that this quality may in time inspire and inform his painting. The *Crucifix* which he has sent this year, and which hangs in the Sculpture Room, is a very striking piece of design, and all the more striking for being Mr. Sargent's. For it has in it some of the very opposite characteristics to those which distinguish the bulk of his work. Upon the Cross Christ hangs in agony, and bound to the sacred body are a man and a woman, types of sinning, suffering humanity. Each holds up a chalice to catch the drops falling from the wounded hands. Beneath Christ's feet is the bruised serpent, and below that again the pelican feeding its young upon its own flesh. The ideas which this fine work conveys are of the first order, and the execution is very powerful. Its qualities of linear design and decorative modelling are instinct with force and truth and beauty. Perhaps here and there the grotesque intrudes a shade more than it should in a perfect design upon a theme of this nature. The face of the man does not give quite the right feeling, for example. But it is, beyond question, a work nobly imagined, almost of inspiration, and, coming from Mr. Sargent, it must be accepted as an omen full of promise for the future. This, and other works in the Sculpture Room at Burlington House, and, I should like to add, the pictures painted in *tempera* at the New Gallery, are bright hopeful spots upon the dull materialism of the Art of to-day.

H. HAMILTON FYFE.

THE PRESSING NEED FOR MORE UNIVERSITIES

I. THE FOUNDATIONS OF COMMERCIAL SUPREMACY

A FAVOURITE subject at the present time, both with speakers and with writers in the public Press, is the stationary condition of our trade and manufactures as compared with the enormous strides made by Germany and the United States. Yet, although the need of education is often spoken of, very few of our public men appear to realise the true foundation of the success of Germany at the present time.

For the absence of growth or, in some departments, the decay of our manufactures and commerce, two defects in our social conditions are chiefly responsible. The first is one difficult to remove, except by the chastening influence of poverty. I mean the attitude of fat content resulting from a generation of trade without rivals, and displayed in the lack of industry and enterprise of which our foreign consuls complain, and which so impresses our American critics. More important still, however, is the lack of *trained* intelligence, of scientific method in almost all departments of the community, which is as evident in our conduct of war as in our manufacture of dye-stuffs.

Owing to the lack of trained brains, the major portion of the chemical industry, with the exception of the alkali trade, has left England, its original home, for Germany. At the present moment we are on the eve of a wholesale destruction of a great Anglo-Indian industry, that of indigo production, by the inventions of a German firm of chemists. Our explosives, our drugs, our dyes, are made in Germany. Our scientific instruments and glassware of all descriptions come from the same country. On the other hand, our steel trade is being absorbed by America, which has already attained the first place in the manufacture of machine tools, electrical industrial appliances, and agricultural instruments.

It is evident that, if we would stay this continuous advance of our competitors at our expense, we must study the methods used by them, in order that, in the coming struggle for commercial supremacy, we may at least fight them on equal ground. The

factors which make for industrial success can be very easily summed up: the possession of natural resources, freedom to use these resources, and power or knowledge to utilise them. With regard to the first factor, we are possibly inferior to the United States, unless we include our colonies, as we ought to do, as part of England. In both the first and second factors we have the advantage over Germany, *i.e.* in greater mineral wealth, and exemption from forced military service. It is clear, then, that Germany's advantage lies in the third factor, *viz.* the power to utilise the forces of nature, which are at her, as at our, disposal. Now this power is given by science, and science alone. The enormous advances during the last hundred years have so changed the order of things that the race is no longer to the strong, but to the wise. Intellectual supremacy means now commercial supremacy. Some faint glimmering of this fact has come into the minds of our public men, our guilds and our philanthropists, and they have, in all good conscience, acted upon the inspiration by setting up technical colleges and polytechnics, and giving money grants for success in examinations in elementary science. They may point proudly to the fact that now they have made the artisan and the board-school child 'scientific,' and commercial supremacy ought to follow as a matter of course.

But our trade and industries continue to drift away from us as before. Our work in this direction is apparently a failure, because it has been begun at the wrong end. We have sought to apply science before we had the science itself to apply. The greatest advances in science which have had at the same time a marked influence on industrial developments have been made by men whose sole object has been the furtherance of pure knowledge, and not of their own pecuniary position. In nearly all cases, however, these men have been sheltered from the struggle for bare existence either by private fortune or by the possession of a modest stipend and adequate laboratories and material for their investigations.

Herein lies the secret of Germany's present success. For many years, even in her most troublous times, she has enjoyed the use of universities scattered far and wide over the country and maintained by the local ruling power, State or prince, the sole function of which has been the advancement and diffusion of knowledge for its own sake. In the pre-scientific age the increased culture resulting from these universities had to be its own reward. The advent of modern science, however, has made each of these centres of learning a potent instrument for the advancement of the material prosperity of the nation. Their existence has made it possible for the most intelligent students to devote their whole life to the furtherance of knowledge, well aware that a career was open to them, honourable, if not lucrative, in which they might give their best for their science, without paying the penalty of grinding poverty.

The work proceeding from these universities has raised Germany to the first place in the intellectual world. In all departments of knowledge, literature, history or science, men turn for information to the German masters, so that it has almost become a truism that, if a student cannot read German, he might as well not read at all, so large a part does the German work play in the burning questions, literary and scientific, of the present day.

But the multiplicity of State-aided universities in Germany has had another effect on the advance of that country. Every year thousands of young men leave these universities trained in scientific method, trained to distinguish between the true and the false in things. This is the army with which Germany is conquering the world's markets. As chemists, engineers, manufacturers, these men apply the scientific method to practical affairs, their acquired power of discrimination enabling them to seize on every advance that is made in pure science, and to turn it to practical advantage.

No better example of the interaction of universities and industrial pursuits, of pure science and technology, could be given than the newly effected commercial synthesis of indigo, mentioned earlier in this article. About thirty years ago, Baeyer, now professor in Munich, studying the chemical nature of indigo, found that it could be broken down into various known coal-tar derivatives, and later on he succeeded in synthesising the dye-stuff from these derivatives. It is interesting to notice that in his artificial production of indigo, he made use of the so-called 'Perkins synthesis' worked out by the well-known English discoverer of aniline dyes. The importance of this discovery of Baeyer was at once appreciated by the managers of the 'Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik,' who, with Baeyer, patented the process and proceeded to develop it on a commercial scale. They found, however, that the amount of raw material used in the process, viz. toluene, a coal-tar product, was only just sufficient for the world's consumption in the manufacture of aniline dyes, saccharin, &c., and would not nearly suffice for the amount of indigo annually required. But the thorough knowledge of the indigo group resulting from Baeyer's work gave many possibilities of approaching this substance through other channels. The chemical company employ in their works over eighty chemists, who are not merely trained in chemical manipulation but are also skilled researchers, who have made investigations in university laboratories before their employment by the firm. To this staff, then, was made over the task of finding a method of obtaining indigo from a cheap and abundant coal-tar product. After many laborious years of research the Badische Company have finally succeeded in manufacturing indigo on a commercial scale from naphthalene, which can be produced in enormous quantities at a cheap rate and is largely used for increasing the luminosity of coal gas. Every stage of the process

has involved the work of trained chemists and has necessitated the erection of special plants for the production on a large scale of the materials required. The final result is that the Badische Company are now prepared to supply indigo to the whole world at a price with which the indigo planters cannot compete, and thus to obtain possession of an industry of the annual value of three million pounds.¹

The lesson that we as a nation have to learn is that true industrial advance is impossible without advance in pure science, and that we should be pursuing a strictly utilitarian line of conduct in encouraging the cultivation of knowledge by men who care for nothing except the advancement of their own branch of science.

No whole-hearted man of science can direct his researches along lines of necessary utility. He has merely in all devotion to follow the indications of his experiments, testing and re-testing the revelation they afford before finally accepting it. And if a man in all cases limited himself to a problem, because its solution promised practical advantages, many discoveries which are the basis of our modern industries would never have been made. When Galvani studied the twitchings of some frogs' legs which he had hung by copper hooks on an iron balustrade, he could have had no idea that his discoveries would form the basis of the great electro-chemical industries of the present day. When Ørsted noticed that the passage of a current round a magnet caused a deflection of the needle, the discovery interested only a few savants. Yet this observation, which is directly utilised in the electric telegraph, was also the beginning of a chapter in science which at present deals with the whole question of transmission and utilisation of energy by electrical means—electric lighting, electric locomotion, and the working of metals. The discovery of the Röntgen rays and their uses in medicine is but a small part of a series of researches dealing with some of the most abstruse problems in physics. Pasteur's discoveries relating to fermentation and contagious disorders, which have saved millions of pounds to France, and which, in their applications by Lord Lister, have preserved thousands of human beings from suffering and death, had their starting-point in a research on the asymmetry of crystals.

The moral that we should draw from these considerations is that a nation desiring wealth, industrial and commercial supremacy, must seek first intellectual supremacy, and all these things shall be added unto her. The means to this end has already been shown to

¹ It is noteworthy that Hofmann, years ago, when Professor at the School of Mines, strongly urged the Government to institute and support chemical laboratories, so that we might retain in England the anilin dye industry then being developed by Perkins. His advice, however, fell on deaf ears, and the whole of this industry is now in the hands of Germany, to whom we send the waste products of our gasworks in order to buy back at a large price the dyes manufactured from these same waste products.

us. If we would compete on equal terms with Germany, we must, as she has done, found universities, as many as possible, whose work shall be the increase of knowledge by discovery, by training to discover, and by spreading scientific method among the intelligent population of the land. Of the few universities we have, many are hampered, especially in their scientific departments, by lack of funds. In London, the capital of the empire and the richest city in the world, there is no university at all except on paper, and most of our great manufacturing towns are content with a mechanics' institute.

The absolute lethargy of the public on the subject of higher education is shown by the case of Birmingham, where even the great influence of Mr. Chamberlain has failed to raise more than 400,000*l.* for a university. If the manufacturers of Birmingham once realised the importance to them and to the whole country of such a university, there could be no difficulty in multiplying this sum five times. In fact the general attitude of the public towards universities is that they are more or less of luxuries, to diffuse a smattering of general culture and to give a tone to, or label with a degree, a favoured few of our countrymen, and it has no conception that our very existence as a nation is bound up with this question of universities. The Government show, too, that they are not in advance of public opinion by voting less than 100,000*l.* a year for the whole of university teaching in the British Isles. At the same time, the Government spends 50,000,000*l.* a year on the maintenance of the Army and Navy, an expenditure which we have been told time after time is to be looked upon in the nature of an insurance. What should we think of any firm that spent half its income on fire insurance, and nothing at all on the development of its business?

Of course, in former days, when our consciences were easier, or other Powers weaker, the Army and Navy could be regarded as means of extending our business and possessions, and were so used, though righteous horror would be excited nowadays at the bare suggestion of such a method for increasing our wealth.

The struggle of the twentieth century will be, not for lands, but for control over the forces of nature. Here, at any rate, Liberalism and Imperialism could join hands in fighting the spirit of reaction and Conservatism, and the lethargic self-satisfaction which bids fair to sink our empire to a second or third place among the nations.

But the question is vital to every inhabitant of these islands. Already in America public opinion has awakened to the enormous importance of the development of universities for the practical success of the nation; and its millionaires vie with one another in founding magnificent universities equipped in all points for their work, where picked men may extend ever wider their knowledge of natural phenomena, and where armies of young men may be trained in scientific method before being turned out into the workshop and

factory. Recognising, however, that the intellect must be allowed to develop in all directions, there is in these universities no restriction of the work to science or to subjects which are evidently utilitarian. Literature and art are as richly provided for as the sciences, in order that the nation may attain a full and complete intellectual development and be fitted to contend for the first place among the nations of the earth.

As a measure of imperial insurance, we have committed the conduct of our affairs to a Conservative Government, and therefore to one which by its traditions is unlikely on its own initiative to do anything for higher education. But in this country private enterprise has always shown the way to the Government: our rich men have evidenced their regard for their country's welfare by contributing largely in various ways to the cost of the war in South Africa. Will they not take up this greater work—not of insurance, but of development of the country by training its brain-power—the founding of universities in close connection with our great industrial centres and the equipment of the nation for the war of the twentieth century?

II. AN IDEA OF A UNIVERSITY FOR LONDON

One of the most striking examples of our country's indifference in matters of higher education is the fact that London, the capital of the empire and the centre of its mental activities in science, literature, and industrial development, has no university worthy of the name. Seventy years ago a body of men interested in education, and perceiving the poverty of London in this respect, founded at their own cost a University of London which should be open to all comers and all denominations. Objections, however, were raised to allowing this institution (now known as University College) to grant degrees, and after the foundation of King's College as a Church of England institution, both bodies consented to the foundation of a purely examining body, which took on the title of University of London, and which has stood in the way of the advancement of education in London ever since.

This obstacle has now, however, been removed. The new statutes for the university drawn up by the Statutory Commissioners, and approved by her late Majesty in June 1900, have so modified the constitution of the university that, without undue distortion of its statutes, it might be made to gather up the disconnected attempts at higher education which are being made in London by various bodies, and to develop out of them a university that should have some influence on the intellectual growth of the country, and be worthy of the capital of the empire.

But statutes cannot make a university, nor can we, by a combination of the inadequate teaching resources of London, make them adequate for the needs of this city. When the German Government

took possession of Strasburg, they took over at the same time its ancient university, already provided with institutes for the teaching of the various branches of knowledge. Since that time they have spent on the university buildings a capital sum of 700,000*l.*, in addition to a yearly grant for expenses of 47,000*l.* And this is for a university whose total number of students averages just over 1,000. In the case of other universities of more continuous development, it is not so easy to arrive at the amount of the capital sum spent on their buildings. It is instructive, however, to note the value placed by the State on the training of these universities, as represented by the annual grant from State or Imperial funds. Berlin, with 4,000 to 5,000 matriculated students, and 4,000 to 5,000 other students, has a yearly grant of 120,000*l.* Vienna, with 5,000 to 6,000 students, receives 100,000*l.*; Heidelberg, with 1,200 students, 37,000*l.* Berne, in Switzerland, with 800 students, obtains a yearly grant of 24,000*l.* Thus the yearly grant made by these various governments towards the expenses of educating *each* student varies from 20*l.* to 50*l.* To this sum we must add the small amounts paid by each student as fees—about 10*l.* to 20*l.* a year—as well as small sums accruing from invested property.

These figures enable us to form some idea of the resources that must be at the disposal of the new University of London if it is to compete on equal grounds with the similar institutions on the Continent. With 10,000 students it would need an annual income of at least 400,000*l.*, altogether apart from the capital sum necessary to build and equip the university institutes. But if the university is to play a part in the economic development of the country and to attract to itself this number of students, it will be impossible to raise the whole of this sum by students' fees. If each student has to pay 30*l.* to 50*l.* a year for his education, apart altogether from his living expenses, university training will be limited, as at present, to a select few. In order that the university may each year turn out an army of trained experts to take part in the industrial warfare of the present time, a portion at any rate of these expenses must be met by means of endowments or grants from the State or public bodies, so as to reduce the yearly cost of education to between 10*l.* and 20*l.* Moreover, it is to be hoped that numbers of scholarships and bursaries may be established, enabling the picked students of the polytechnics and technical institutes to give up wage-earning for a time and devote three or four years to a thorough study of some science in the university. We should, in fact, besides Huxley's ladder from the board school to the university, provide another for those poorer students whose superior mental endowments are first displayed when they are brought into contact with practical science.

The establishment of a University of London along these lines

four millions and an annual endowment in some shape or other of 200,000*l.*, which would be irrespective of some 200,000*l.* from students' fees. It is not, however, necessary, nor would it be advisable, to start a university on this great scale. The important matter at present is to provide a university adequate for the needs of the students whom we might expect to present themselves at once, being careful at the same time to establish it in such a way that it would admit of expansion in accordance with the growth of the demand for its training—a demand that will be governed by the increased success of our manufactures when directed by men trained in scientific method.

A university, founded now, would probably have to provide instruction for about 3,000 students. In making this provision, it would be possible for the university in many cases to obtain possession of and utilise existing endowments and buildings. Indeed, as long ago as 1885 Professor Karl Pearson indicated the means by which this might be accomplished. He suggested that the two bodies of university rank in London, viz. University and King's Colleges, should hand themselves over to the university. This latter body would thus possess two nuclei, from which might grow out university institutes, carrying on teaching and research in the various faculties of arts, science, engineering and medicine, and co-ordinated and directed by the central university. In Professor Pearson's scheme, the largest and most compact faculty in London, *i.e.* the medical, is hardly taken into account. If, however, the university possessed teaching institutes in two or more parts of London, and were possessed of sufficient funds to develop these institutes, it would be easy to concentrate in them all the scientific part of the medical curriculum at present taught with indifferent success and much waste of time and material in all the eleven hospital schools of London. These schools could then turn their whole attention to the development of our knowledge and treatment of disease. No other city in the world presents such opportunities as London for the study of disease, and in no civilised town are the opportunities so neglected. The necessity of teaching the purely scientific subjects of the medical curriculum, such as chemistry, physics, physiology, and anatomy, imposed on the schools by the absence of central university institutes where these subjects could be properly studied, cripples the schools and the development of their proper work, involving, as it does, a large expenditure on the equipment and upkeep of laboratories and the absorption of the best energies of their younger men in cramming students for the qualifying examinations, to the exclusion of research into the causation and treatment of disease. Moreover, this expenditure of time and energy, owing to its wasteful diffusion, is unproductive of good results, and fails to attain efficiency of teaching in these subjects.

Let us see what changes would be involved by the abolition

of the two colleges and the establishment in their place of two branches of the university. In the first place, it would be necessary that the transference of lands and endowments should be complete. The university should have an absolutely free hand to increase the number of teachers, to appoint new professors or confirm former ones, or to pension off those of the existing staff whom it regarded as unfit. In neither of the two colleges is the present accommodation sufficient for the greater requirements of a university, and both have certain encumbrances. The expenditure, however, that would be necessary to fit them for the purposes of the university would be extremely small compared with that necessary for buying land and building a new institute. Thus, at University College, an expenditure of 160,000*l.* would be sufficient to free the whole buildings for university purposes, and to provide the increased accommodation in the scientific departments which would be *immediately* necessary. This expenditure would place at the disposal of the university an institute with endowments, freehold lands and buildings of the value of three-quarters of a million, with a space of 1½ acres freehold for future development.

A somewhat less expenditure would place the buildings of King's College at the disposal of the university. The transference would, however, naturally destroy the Church of England character of this teaching centre; and it is not known whether the authorities of King's College would consent to the change, though there is no doubt that it would be in the best interests of higher education in London.

These two institutes would, however, barely suffice for the present needs of London; and it seems imperative that, while the chance is yet open, the university should take advantage of the open space adjoining its examination rooms and offices at South Kensington to establish here a third institute, teaching in several if not in all faculties of knowledge. There are, moreover, in the neighbourhood of the university two well-equipped institutes, the City Guilds' Central Institute for Technical Education and Engineering, and the Royal College of Science, for which the Government is now erecting new and ample buildings. The university would have to consider seriously whether it could not also absorb these institutes. There seems to be no reason why their administration should not be handed over to the university, which would act, so to speak, as trustees for the Government and for the City Guilds, care being taken that the express purposes for which these buildings were erected and endowed should not be allowed to suffer under the altered management. Such an absorption would seem to be advisable in consequence of the fact that a large amount of work of university character, the preparation of students for degrees and the carrying on of research work, is already undertaken in these institutes which should therefore not be left

out of account in any attempt to co-ordinate the higher teaching facilities of London.

We should thus have a university with three centres in the North, West, and South of London, each of which might be made equivalent to a provincial university, but maintaining a certain community of aims and standards under the central governing body of the university. The fourth centre, that for the East of London, for which we must probably await some munificent donation, might in time be the most important of all. In this part of London there should be a great institute, richly endowed, teaching especially in the faculties of science and applied science, which should give a university training to the picked men coming to it from the technical and secondary schools, and supply trained men, experts in their subjects, to serve as directors and masters in the factories and works which extend eastwards along the banks of the Thames. The presence of the largest hospital in London in these parts would probably lead to the establishment of a faculty of medicine in this branch of the university, which would, therefore, serve as a centre for the study of the scientific portions of the medical curriculum.

From the slight sketch just given of a possible University for London, it will be seen that its foundation depends on the possibility of obtaining funds. The teaching of science cannot be made to pay, unless it be degenerated to a series of monster cram classes. The more valuable the teaching of science is to the community as a whole, the less will it be self-supporting; and the deficit becomes greater as we desire to extend scientific training among the people by diminishing the fees charged to the students. In the provinces this fact is beginning to be dimly recognised, and the universities are growing, and are nourished by gifts prompted by local patriotism, or extorted by pertinacious representatives from the Government. In London, with its enormously greater needs, it seems vain to appeal to local patriotism. Our representatives are more interested in the conduct of the Irish members than in the education of their constituents. If the Metropolitan members had any other idea of a university than as an introduction to polite society, they could prevail on even a Conservative Government to give an adequate grant in aid to the Imperial University of London. If our men of business could realise the absolute necessity of higher education and research for the industrial development of the country, they would not grudge a small portion of their wealth for the foundation and maintenance of laboratories, professorships, and scholarships.

SOME REAL LOVE LETTERS¹

LOVE affairs, though doubtless of supreme interest to most of us at one period of our lives, are often—perhaps generally—regarded after that period rather as ‘curiosities of natural history’ than as coming home to the business or the bosoms of mature men and women. *Nous avons passé par là*, no doubt, but we have left that region very far behind our weary footsteps of to-day; and we, the foot-sore travellers, cannot verily believe ourselves the same persons as they who once danced lightly on that enchanted ground. Or else, though we may recognise ourselves as still the same—since ‘tis *in* ourselves that we are thus or thus—we say that that ground of our consciousness was indeed enchanted; it was a dream, an illusion of the sense, upon which our youthful spirit moved and danced; it had no foundation in the solid facts of the world.

Such, I believe, is with very many persons the retrospect of after life upon their brief season of ‘love-making.’ But if this be the case it is certainly remarkable that the subject is of such perennial and wide interest as is indicated, for instance, by the demand and supply of the literary market. The huge and ever-increasing flood of novels poured out year by year is mostly—to the chagrin of some of us—concerned with this same limited and monotonous theme; but the theme palls not upon the public ear. And recent excitements and enthusiasms in devouring the history of love affairs as unfolded in love letters, genuine or fictitious, bear a like witness even more impressively. For in most successful narrative novels a greater variety of fare is presented to the reader than a love tale in epistolary form, by the nature of the case, can furnish. Plot, development of various characters, dialogue witty or pathetic, scenic or picturesque description—many if not all of these must by turns relieve the palate, lest it be jaded by the flavour of honey, albeit culled from the sweetest flower that life produces. It is, then, the more noteworthy that, in the absence of all these reliefs, such a stir, such a depth of interest in the public as to recall that which followed upon the appearance of *Adam Bede* forty years ago, should be created by the reading of mere love letters.

¹ *Lettres de Mademoiselle de Lescapins*. Revues sur les éditions originales.

Criticism and even censure (as we all know) have not been lacking—as, for example, in the case of the Browning and Keats letters—upon the discretion, or the want of it, manifest in the publication of any love letters whatever. Is it right, is it seemly, is it profitable, say objectors, to lay these things bare before a careless world? before a coarse world? a perverse and malicious? a stupid and misinterpreting, apt to wrest things that should be for its wealth into occasions of falling? To all these questions from Doubting Castle such publication lies open.

But let us elect to leave Doubting Castle and come out into the open. Let us profess a strong faith that there is virtue that goes out from revelations of exceptional and tragic passion, which arrest and enchain the attention even of those who condemn them. It is not in the stimulation or the satisfaction of any ignoble or prurient curiosity that lies their spell; let any such hint be far from us, for the honour of human nature! No; the spell is in that they fulfil the demand made upon tragedy of old, that it should 'purify the emotions by pity and terror;' that they illuminate the heights and depths, the glories and the powers of that humanity which is with most of us so 'cribb'd, cabin'd, and confin'd' that it can scarce recognise itself as the offspring of God; that they exhibit the passion which can drag men lowest, or raise them highest, 'purely purged of all its dross,' and attaining, through sorrow, to immortal fame which ennobles alike the hero and them that revere him.

For the rest, the heroic race in real life (as all know who are careful to observe them) are simple and outspoken as little children; their 'dignity' is the last thing with which they are *consciously* concerned, for they by instinct act upon the maxim, *Never stand upon your dignity, but let your dignity stand upon you!* They take the whole world into their confidence, and rely upon the sympathy of their fellow-creatures; and their trust is not mocked—any more than that of a little child that holds up a hurt hand to a kind stranger's face to be 'kissed well again.' Have we not known? Have we not seen? What so knit the affection of this country to our great Queen, lately dead, as her direct appeal in her sorrow to the sympathy of her people, telling them, as she might tell her own children, all the burthen on her heart—great matters and small, all set forth 'in truth and daylight'? Or can any strictures on 'indiscretion,' 'want of reticence,' and the like impair the nobility and simplicity of Carlyle's penance *coram populo*, for all the shortcomings and offences with which he had to charge himself toward his lost wife? There the old man stands—in his last appearance before his country, as he willed to make it—sorrowing, like Johnson in Uttoxeter market-place, for little petty unkindnesses and slights never to be undone, never to be atoned for to the object of them; and to how many must the admonition come home!

Yes! when heroes speak let us, who are not heroes, listen and perpend; and let there be no cavilling that the speaking is as a man speaketh unto his friend.

But to revert to my particular subject at present. In this matter of love letters comparisons naturally occur to us. Many will doubtless recall to mind the hapless Vanessa, whose story has had so singular a fascination for so many generations. But very few of Vanessa's letters remain to us; and those of her strange, redoubtable tutor-quasi-lover are occupied mainly in tearing away the garb of passion and romance with which she, poor lady, would persist in arraying the relation between them. We can imagine with what fierce and morbid indignation he would have prohibited the constant flight towards him of perfervid *billets d'adoration*, such as succeed one another in the pages I am about to cite. A certain amount of dalliance he permits, to her and to himself; but the limits are sternly drawn, in bizarre contrast with some phrases used; and the history of that cruelly pathetic passion which killed her has to be inferred from external facts, from hints in his journal to her rival, from the ambiguous verses which give his own account of the early days of their *liaison*, and from the never-to-be-forgotten scene of their last parting, which (if authentic) she must herself have told to some friendly ear—for who could carry such a memory in complete silence?

But there is another story of the same kind, which is of deeper significance than Vanessa's (who, indeed, seems to have been noteworthy only in the force of her passionate love, and in the fact that it was lavished upon Swift). That other is the story of the remarkable woman whose letters are the subject of the present paper. It is, no doubt, well known to many who are familiar with French literature of the eighteenth century; but it is so strange and impressive a piece of human life that I may be pardoned, I trust, if, at the risk of wearying some persons by the repetition of a thrice-told tale, I hope to interest others by setting it forth.

Mademoiselle de Lespinasse is unquestionably one of the most brilliant and interesting figures in that brilliant and interesting society, *aux bords de l'abîme*, which was the last efflorescence of old France before the Revolution finally engulfed it. It was a society, doubtless, of very lax morality, mined by decay of all the old pieties and charities which had for centuries held Christendom together; yet these very letters, while bearing testimony to that, testify no less how hard it is to kill the divine seeds of righteousness and loving-kindness in men's hearts. Mademoiselle de Lespinasse, in her own character, displays both sides of the picture. She had, in the sense in which Christian people understand the word, almost no personal 'morality' as a woman; yet she was generous, tender-hearted, veracious and high-minded, and in denouncing her frailties

we must make the distinction, so earnestly insisted upon by Coleridge, that she was 'pure though not chaste.'

Julie Jeanne Eléonore de Lespinasse was born at Lyons in 1732. She had in reality no right to any noble *nom de famille*; the surname of Lespinasse, by which she was always known, appertaining to a branch of the family of the Comtes d'Albon, to which both her mother and her mother's husband belonged. M. and Madame d'Albon lived apart for many years, and the usual mystery attending the origin of illegitimate children encompasses the childhood and early youth of the poor girl, the offspring of an intrigue of her mother's, with whom is not known. Madame d'Albon, however, brought her up openly at her house in Lyons, giving, one must suppose, such plausible account of the child as she could (the baptismal register is of the daughter of respectable '*bourgeois de Lyon*,' but the significant entry is, '*Le père n'a signé pour être absent*'). She made no secret, moreover, of her tender love for her daughter; and Mademoiselle de Lespinasse, for the first fifteen years of her life, received more affection, and a more careful education also, than many, perhaps most legitimate children of the *noblesse de province* of the day. But she lost her mother in 1747, and then her sorrows, which were to be lifelong, began.

She had to find a home, or rather a shelter, with her married half-sister, her mother's elder and legitimate daughter. This person and her husband, the Marquis de Vichy-Chamrond, together with the Comte d'Albon, her brother, appear to have been mainly concerned towards the poor illegitimate orphan, hardly more than a child, first to prevent her ever making *réclamation d'état* (the claim of legitimacy and consequent sharing in the family property), which, they feared, was possible, inasmuch as her mother and theirs was only separated, not divorced from her husband; next to get as much service out of her as they could, in return for the bare maintenance which they were practically obliged to give her. They could hardly have been blamed for more resistance to a possible claim in law which every one knew was not justifiable in fact; but their methods were harsh and mean; and, what was more, their attitude ought in common fairness to have been modified in consideration of the generous simplicity of the poor young girl herself. For there is strong evidence² that Mademoiselle de Lespinasse (it is a characteristic trait), on inheriting, by her mother's will, a sum of ready money, would have yielded to secure her complete independence, and surrendered it conditionally to her half-brother, the Comte d'Albon, trusting that he (with whom she had been brought up) would prove to her a brother indeed. The very reverse proved the case.

² Quoted by M. Eugène Amy, *Mademoiselle de Lespinasse*, p. 118. *Le traître sur*

treat her with contumely and even cruelty, not only did the Vichys drudge her as a nursery governess to their children, but they all vehemently opposed her leaving her servitude, either for a convent—for which she passionately expressed her preference to remaining in their *château*—or for a much more cheerful lot (to all appearance) which, after several miserable years at Chantrond, was offered her.

This was not a proposal of marriage—that her relations would probably have opposed likewise, since it would have entailed the claim (*réclamation d'état*) which touched their pockets. It was an offer which, for the rest, was, I dare say, more attractive to her than most marriages of which she could have a chance *en province*—the offer of going to Paris, to live there as *demoiselle de compagnie* to the sister of M. de Vichy-Chamrond.

This sister was none other than the celebrated Marquise du Deffand, the queen of one of the most renowned *salons* in Paris, at once *grande dame*, *bel esprit*, and *philosophe*, the future friend and correspondent of Horace Walpole. Madame du Deffand was now fifty-seven, and growing blind; she was anxious to secure the companionship of a charming young woman of good education, such as, after a summer spent at Chamrond, she well knew Mademoiselle de Lespinasse to be, and the latter was almost equally anxious to accept her proposal. In the end their joint wishes prevailed (in 1754), but not till after a long conflict with the Vichys and M. d'Albon (in which Mademoiselle de Lespinasse suffered much), and at last rather by sufferance than consent of her relations. Whether, if happiness be in question, the event was a gain for her may be doubted; in point of renown and the full exercise of her remarkable powers it certainly was so.

At first all went smoothly between her and her patroness; and it is rather wonderful that two such people lived together for ten years without an open rupture than that the rupture came at last. For Mademoiselle de Lespinasse was of a warmly, nay *holly* affectionate nature, capable of the utmost devotion to those she loved (she was fond to the last of the Vichy young people, to whose education she had been enslaved by their parents), but proud, impulsive, and often, it is plainly to be seen, unreasonable. Madame du Deffand, on the other hand, though not absolutely hard-hearted, was frankly selfish; a complete pagan, and not a kindly specimen of paganism either. At the end of the ten years' companionship, in 1764, she had become quite blind, and dependent more than ever upon the society of her friends for any satisfaction in life remaining to her.

It must be admitted that her condition ought to have secured her both compassion and loyalty from the younger woman, to whom she had given a home. But it is very difficult to be always compassionate and loyal towards a selfish, suspicious, jealous, and sometimes malicious old woman. We do not know what may have

been Mademoiselle de Lespinasse's struggles to do right by Madame du Deffand; we may be sure her provocations to do wrong were great. Howsoever it came about, the storm burst at length. Madame du Deffand (who habitually turned night into day, since day was night to her) found out that, before her late *réveil*, her companion was becoming accustomed daily to receive her friends—those who owed her supreme allegiance—and to receive them on their way, as it were, to her! It is easy to see that such a state of things might grow up, as Madame du Deffand's hours grew later and later, without any deliberate 'treason' on the part of Mademoiselle de Lespinasse; but it was inevitable that such a one as Madame du Deffand should treat it as *une trahison infâme*. '*Elle jeta les hauts cris*'; it became impossible for them to continue together, and they separated. Mademoiselle de Lespinasse, indeed, to her honour, attempted a reconciliation; but Madame du Deffand haughtily and firmly rejected her appeal, and to the last day of Mademoiselle de Lespinasse's life, it would seem, cherished against her a rancorous resentment. It was, no doubt, all the more bitter and persistent through the extraordinary sequel to the separation of the two women. This was no less than the break-up of the famous *salon* of Madame du Deffand. It split into two parties, fidly half of its members (and among these some of the most eminent) siding with Mademoiselle de Lespinasse in the quarrel, and forming around her a new *salon*, of which she was the life and soul, becoming henceforth one of the great powers of Parisian society.

It was a remarkable spectacle. Here was a young woman of two-and-thirty—absolutely alone in the world, a bastard of obscure origin, poor, with neither beauty nor that physical ascendancy of nature which often stands in its stead—able to attract to herself the allegiance, which as long as she lived never failed or wavered, of some of the best intellects in France; to maintain and inspire a *foyer* of the great intellectual movement of that strange time which prepared and ushered in the Revolution. It was in virtue of her character and personality that this particular nucleus of the thought of the day cohered; at her death one of the friends standing round her bed could say, '*Nous voilà tous séparés : on peut nous appliquer ces paroles de l'Écriture : "le Seigneur a frappé le berger, et le troupeau s'est dispersé."*' And so it proved. When the charm, the ready sympathy and insight, the devotion of heart, the ardour both of intellect and affections and charities, to which all who sorrowed for her bear witness—when all these went down into her grave, the circle where d'Alembert and Condorcet, Turgot and the virtuous La Rochefoucauld of the Revolution days had rejoiced to meet broke up.

Turgot, we are told—
presque du même âge qu'elle, la prenait pour confidente de ses plus secrètes pensées.

de philosophe, et bientôt de ministre réformateur . . . nommer tous ceux qui fréquentèrent le salon de mademoiselle de Lespinasse serait passer en revue ce que de 1764 à 1776 la France eut de plus illustre dans tous les genres.³

But amongst them all the man who first profoundly affected her personal destiny was d'Alembert, then the recognised chief of the *parti philosophique*. He had been one of the chief *habitués* of Madame du Deffand's circle, and was appealed to by her, on her rupture with Mademoiselle de Lespinasse, to arbitrate between them. He was not only an eminent man of science and letters, as is well known, but also a man of great probity and true nobility of nature; so that it is all the more impressive to find that he pronounced for Mademoiselle de Lespinasse as having the rights of the quarrel. Cavillers, it is true, might say that his verdict can be accounted for by the relations between him and the younger of the ladies concerned; but in view of his character this is a very unlikely supposition. It is very probable that it was gratitude, added to what was undoubtedly a 'tender friendship' of several years' standing, which led Mademoiselle de Lespinasse, when d'Alembert fell dangerously ill in the year after she left Madame du Deffand, to go and nurse him; and gratitude doubtless came in to reinforce tender friendship with him too. Upon his recovery he took a lodging in the house where she had established herself on quitting her patroness, and there, under the same roof, but ('*ce qui, jusqu'à un certain point, sauvaît les apparences*') not in the same *appartement*, they lived many years side by side—as did several other lodgers.

Of course, even in the Paris of 1765, all this occasioned some talk, not to say scandal. But there seems to be strong evidence that Mademoiselle de Lespinasse was never what David Hume '*assez crûment*' calls her, d'Alembert's mistress, but that the relation between them was precisely that which her own friends assert it to have been, that of a tender and romantic friendship. This is the more credible, that in the then state of Parisian morality (or immorality) a *liaison* of the other kind, carried on even between persons of the 'highest consideration,' provoked no censure, though it might make some passing gossip; so that there was no inducement to any denial or disguise of the real state of the case, had it been such. On the other hand it is pretty certain that the poor thing herself at one time much wished d'Alembert to marry her; the craving to be loved and cherished, and to love and cherish in return, was supreme in her to the last. But marriage did not enter into d'Alembert's thoughts, though, till her death, nothing could be more faithful and tender than his friendship. '*Éh! mon Dieu! que deviendrais-je avec une femme et des enfants?*' are his words, writing to Voltaire in 1766 upon a report that he was about to marry her. Indeed, one strong obstacle to their marriage must have been that both were very poor

³ *Assez*, *Notice Biographique*, p. xxx.

(both, strangely enough, the illegitimate offspring of women of quality). Poverty, however, would not have weighed against marriage with *her* romantic and impassioned nature; nothing is more striking in her character than its entire detachment from all considerations of money or worldly position, a detachment manifest again and again in her conduct as in her letters. And be it noted, in passing, to the credit of the society frequenting her *salon*, that they came there solely for 'the feast of reason and the flow of soul.' Mademoiselle de Lespinasse was too poor to offer even a cup of coffee to her friends; and whatever sins were chargeable to this set of people, any seeking after luxury and the pleasures of the table was not one. They went willingly to the rich Madame Geoffrin's suppers and to Mademoiselle de Lespinasse's bare table, to both for the same reason—that both *salons* fostered that *s'entretenir* on a thousand topics of politics, letters, religion, morals, economics, which was the very breath of the nostrils to the intellect of France of that day, stifling in its ancient cage.

D'Alembert was as disinterested, as much aloof from worldly considerations, as Mademoiselle de Lespinasse herself, but he would seem to have been of Swift's way of regarding the life domestic. Alas that it was so! for different indeed might have been the fate of her passionate heart; tempest-tossed, could it have found its haven 'after God's ordinance in the holy estate of matrimony' with a man of his worth and uprightness. But it was not to be; and her great need, together with the utter absence of any counsellor other than her own hungry heart, of even any tradition in her mind and conscience of obedience to a law that should control its desires, threw her helpless upon such satisfactions as could be had from a *liaison* outside marriage, such as was the height of the fashion in the 'best society' of the time.

After it had become clear (we must suppose) that her friend was not to be her husband, she was for more than four years tenderly devoted to the Marquis de Mora, a young Spanish nobleman of great gifts and graces, of ardent and chivalrous nature, it would seem of some real worth and merit also. He was the son of the then Ambassador of Spain to the Court of France, where he had '*un très grand succès*'; and not there only, but in the *monde philosophique* also—a somewhat unusual conjunction, but consequent upon his having taken up the liberal and reforming ideas of Aranda, then Minister of Charles the Third, who had just carried the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain. It is easy to imagine how attractive would be such a personality as the Marquis de Mora's to Mademoiselle de Lespinasse. For the rest he was *fort grand seigneur*, ten years younger than she, and already married, but apparently living very little with his wife (a daughter of the Minister Aranda)—if indeed the wife was living at this time, which is not clear. Mademoiselle de

Lespinasse and he seem to have been equally and deeply attached (though even d'Alembert, it would appear, was ignorant how deeply, till after her death). But in the fifth year of their *liaison* (August 1772) Mora was obliged to leave France on account of his health. His lungs were attacked, and she had the grief of parting with him, for an absence and to a distance which had a very different aspect in those days from that they would bear now.

It was in this forlorn and derelict condition that she fell a prey (there is literally no other word) to the desperate passion which brought her to her grave, which was her shame and her horror as well as her conqueror, and which inspired the letters that have made her name famous in the literature of France.

Its object was the then much-talked-of soldier and writer, the Comte de Guibert—he whom Napoleon afterwards acknowledged as his first master in the art of war. At the time when Mademoiselle de Lespinasse made M. de Guibert's acquaintance his renown in French and even in European society was at its height. His *Essai sur la Tactique* was thought to initiate a new departure in military science; and in the *Discours Préliminaire* which he prefixed to it he indicated yet a wider scope of his view—no less than the reform of the State as well as of the army in France. He was handsome, agreeable in society, not only a gallant soldier and the son of a gallant soldier, but no mean scholar, and full of literary and 'philosophic' tastes and ambitions. 'M. de Guibert,' said Voltaire, '*veut aller à la gloire par tous les chemins.*' All society, *la cour et la ville*, rang with his name. In short, he was in every way qualified to be the chosen of Mademoiselle de Lespinasse, except that (like M. de Mora) he was much her junior—and if only it had not been disgraceful, even according to the *code de l'amour* of the day, that she should be attached to him at all.

The celebrated letters bear piteous testimony to the struggles of her heart and conscience, as she thought of M. de Mora, ill and far away, while she was allowing herself to fall into this *abîme*, and growing every day more unfaithful to him. They are all (strange spectacle!) addressed to his supplanter.

Ah! mon Dieu (she writes to Guibert in May 1773, some nine months after her parting with Mora), *par quel charme ou par quelle fatalité êtes-vous venu me distraire? Que ne suis-je morte dans le mois de septembre, je serais morte alors sans regret, et sans avoir de reproche à me faire.*

She ought also to have felt—it appears she afterwards did feel—guilty towards d'Alembert, her faithful friend of so many years, and of these sad days still; for after the wont of women, who avenge the pains given them by a lover upon the patient affection of their friends, she now too often made him suffer by her coldness and

* Madame de Staël, *Eloge sur M. de Guib.* &c.

preoccupation of mind. But nothing could compete with the tyranny of her passion; and there seems, alas! no doubt that she surrendered herself entirely to M. de Guibert. Then came the sudden news of the death of M. de Mora (at Bordeaux, 27th. of May, 1774), which, intensifying as it did the terrible warfare in her heart between the old love and the new, all but drove her to suicide. It would seem, by several allusions in the letters, that she was deterred from thus putting an end to her misery by M. de Guibert. He, for his part, seems to have been all along willing to sentimentalise to any length with so gifted, charming, and distinguished a woman as she who had thus thrown herself at his feet; but evidently he was destitute of the principle and resolution which would have enabled a man with any keen sense of honour to withdraw from a relation so manifestly deplorable and degrading, for so noble a nature as hers above all. As Swift with Vanessa so did he dally with her; and their relation, as might be expected, did not hinder him, in the full tide of life (he was but thirty-one, while she was forty-two), from consulting his own wishes and his own interest by marrying a beautiful young lady with a good fortune (June 1775).

This marriage was the last drop in Mademoiselle de Lespinasse's cup of poison. In vain she tried first pride and resentment, then pathetic acceptance of the inevitable—both always *poisoned*, as it were, on the black background of her hopeless love—of her *loves* rather, for the remembrance of Mora and her inconstancy towards him never left her either. It was time that the last act of such a tragedy should finish; as she wrote to Guibert—

Mon ami, je vous l'ai dit souvent, ma situation est impossible à supporter: il y faut une catastrophe: je ne sais si c'est la nature ou la passion qui la produira. Attendons et surtout taisons-nous!

As if she could keep silence!

Indeed, the end was not long delayed; Mademoiselle de Lespinasse died on the 23rd of May, 1776, leaving d'Alembert the executor of her will and of her last wishes. It is refreshing, in this desert of the last days, where almost everything had been burnt up as in a furnace, to read that something of the old tender affection between them not only revived in her, but was expressed once more, though not to the extent he longed for. Such expression as her feeble state allowed she did give, and it was doubtless due to her piercing regret to have used so ill him who had loved her so long and so well.

A un ami commun elle faisait cette confession, que la cause de ses froideurs, de ses vivacités contre d'Alembert était de ne pouvoir lui ouvrir son âme, et lui faire voir les plaies qui la déchiraient.*

* Letter of the 19th of October, 1775.

* *Asso, Notice Biographique*, p. lxi.

It was not till, as her executor, he had to deal with her papers after her death that he learnt the source and extent—or something of the extent—of her sufferings; and it was not till long after his death had followed hers, and Guibert's that of both, that the true history of the double fire that had consumed her became known, by the publication of her letters in 1809.

It speaks much for what we must call the heroism of her nature that this consuming fire never dried up her lovingkindness and charity, both for her friends and for the poor—nor yet her deep concern in the condition and prospects of her country, which in the France of 1774–6 were indeed momentous with hopes and fears.*

As for the Letters, one must venture to say that it would now be wearisomely impossible even for a young person in love, and of the most romantic temperament, to read them straight through. They belong to the epoch which worshipped the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, and, what is more, *se fit presque honneur d'être dominé par la passion, de s'abandonner à sa sensibilité*. And there is in the writer personally, of course, a morbid element which has to be allowed for—so that the same reader will skip largely. But all allowances made, they remain a wonderful monument of passionate devotion, in which is nothing false, nothing artificial—the simple, genuine outpouring of a generous and naturally noble heart, mingled with the *obiter dicta* of an intelligence as keen as it was unpretending; and all this expressed in language remarkable even in French for its simple and easy precision, and certainly also unrivalled in that tongue for its fire. This last is the distinguishing characteristic. Like Madame de Sévigné Mademoiselle de Lespinasse (though with how diverse a character and fortunes!) possesses the power of giving an infinite variety of expression, now graceful, now powerful, now passionate, to the same absorbing affection of the heart.⁹ 'It's all truth and

* 'Moi je ne fais que respirer du malheur dont nous sommes délivrés' [par la mort de Louis XV.]. Lettre du 27 août 1774.

'M. Turgot a déclaré qu'il ne voulait point des 50,000 francs qui lui revenaient de droit . . . il se réduit sur tout; cela donne, après cela, le courage de faire des réformes sur les places qui dépendent de lui. C'est un homme excellent, et s'il peut rester en place, il deviendra l'idole de la nation: il est fanatique du bien public, et il s'y emploie de toute sa force' (30 Sept. 1774).

'Que vous me répondez bien . . . sur milord Shelburne! Oui, c'est justement cela qui fait que je l'estime et je l'aime, d'être chef du parti de l'opposition. Comment n'être pas désolé d'être né dans un gouvernement comme celui-ci? Pour moi, faible et malheureuse créature que je suis, si j'avais à renaitre, j'aimerais mieux être le dernier membre de la chambre des communes que d'être même le roi de Prusse; il n'y a que la gloire de Voltaire qui pourrait me consoler de ne pas être né Anglais' (7 nov. 1774).

'Il est bien plus aisé de ne point vous aimer du tout que de vous aimer modérément' (9 oct. 1774).

'Il faut vous détourner de moi, et vous parler de vous, je n'aurai pas changé d'objet' (14 oct. 1774).

'Tous ces gens qui se ménagent ne s'aiment guère; il y a bien loin entre les

daylight,' as FitzGerald says of Madame de Sévigné, whose 'eternal harping on her daughter' he had once thought would repel him. The letters of both women impress upon us that wonderful gift of the human heart, that of living in the life of another, which is in its essence divine, and the source of all our best bliss. For these evidences of its power *laus Deo!* notwithstanding that the witness of Mademoiselle de Lespinasse testifies also to its perversion.

But we may say of her that her goodness and her strength and her graces were her own, and her faults and errors and frailties those of her time rather than hers. In the working out of her life's tragedy the Christian religion, the Christian religious tradition even, counted for nothing. In her time and country 'the fountains of the great deep were breaking up'—the best and bravest, the most heroic, needed most keenly some support and counsellor other than their own mind, some tribunal of appeal other than their own heart. In the confused struggle the very pole star of human existence was eclipsed; and so it was inevitable that, as in the conduct of the State so in the conduct of personal life, there was no shaping the course, but a wild swaying at the bidding of winds and waves. So it was that passion—'which is intended to be a paroxysm, not a state'—could not issue in the noble and abiding friendship of marriage for this noble woman, but only cast her down as a piteous ruin.

THEO. CHAPMAN.

sentiments qu'on se commande et ceux qui nous commandent: *les premiers sont parfaits et je les abhorre* (16 oct. 1774).

'J'attends de vos nouvelles ce soir. Adieu, mon ami. Si jamais je revenais à la vie, j'aimerais encore à l'employer à vous aimer; mais il n'est plus temps' (derniers mots de la dernière lettre, mai 1776).

A LAND OF WOE

Yes, truly it is a land of woe, because injustice, cruelty, and oppression prevail; if these were absent Morocco might become a land of peace and plenty. In Tangier, its principal port, where I am now staying for a few weeks, I have just had the privilege of meeting the well-known traveller Mrs. Bishop. It was very gratifying for me to learn that it was in consequence of an article written by Lord Meath some five years ago, and which appeared in this Review, that she first began to take an interest in Morocco. In spite of delicate health, for she has only just recovered from an attack of fever, the gifted writer is again off on her travels, and I trust that her clever pen will not fail to draw attention to the suffering which exists in this unhappy land.

After an absence of some years, it was not encouraging to find the same cruelty and wrong rampant as on the occasion of my last visit. When accustomed to the ways of an enlightened country one expects to see gross evils speedily abolished, or at any rate mitigated; consequently it is not easy for the more enterprising dwellers of the West to have patience with the slowness of Orientals, and with the almost utter impossibility of getting them to change their practices, however bad they may be.

Lord Meath wrote on the subject of Moorish prisons, and I am anxious to call the earnest attention of the public to the awful condition of the unfortunate captives in a country separated but by a narrow streak of sea from Europe and civilisation. It is superfluous for me, except for those unacquainted with Eastern ways, to allude to the fact that the word 'prisoner' must not in this country be confused with that of criminal. The former may be a perfectly innocent, inoffensive man, whilst the latter term might not inappropriately be applied in some cases to the judge who has placed him in confinement. In Morocco there is no criminal or secular law, and sentences are pronounced according to the discretion of the individual in power. A man is imprisoned because he happens to have land, money, or some other possession to be 'squeezed' out of him; for in a land where there is no rightful system of taxation, money is pretty certain to be abstracted by wrongful means. In other cases when a crime has actually been committed and the offender has thought it wise to absent himself from his usual surroundings, some harmless individual may be pounced upon by the soldiers, instead of the offender, and put into prison. Once there, no one can tell when he may be released, for the necessity even of keeping a list of prisoners

is considered wholly 'superfluous' by the Moorish official, and the scapegoat may become a 'minseen,' or forgotten one, destined perhaps to end his days in captivity.

Sometimes a relative of the real culprit—mother, father, brother, or uncle—is seized. It may be the unhappy fate of the victim to be transported to a distant prison up-country to take the place of someone who has obtained money to purchase his liberty from the local Kaid. A gentleman whom I have had the pleasure of meeting here, and who has visited several Moorish prisons, told me he had found twenty men confined in loathsome captivity in Al Kazar, in the worst state of neglect, their days possibly numbered through disease. He made inquiries as to the nature of their offence. No one, not even the Bacha himself, could give any information beyond that they had been sent to be imprisoned by a neighbouring governor. If the innocent as well as the guilty have to endure loss of liberty, one could wish that the captivity should involve but little suffering. Alas! the very reverse is the case; and if it were not that wrong must be exposed if it is to be set right, it would be better to draw a veil over the manner in which humanity is outraged in Morocco prisons. Men have there been beaten to death, others have had their eyes put out with hot irons. In this land it was that the fiendish practice existed of cutting the flesh of the hands, rubbing in salt, and tying on raw hide, which contracted and caused mortification to set in and the hands to drop off.

Then we must not overlook the deaths occasioned by neglect, disease, and semi-starvation. The prisoners in the interior get no food, and depend upon what their friends, if they have any, can bring them, and upon the pittance they can earn from basket work. This industry largely depends upon the labours of those in captivity. The large Government prison at Rabat is open to the sky, and in the cold and rainy season the inmates have no protection. But the worst prisons are said to be those in the country, where the unhappy captives live underground; and doubtless many a poor victim to man's cruelty looks anxiously for the time when his body will be confined in a still narrower subterranean prison. Indeed, when living in Morocco, one is led to feel that death is far too often maligned, and that we ought to regard it as a veritable angel of mercy sent to free the sufferer from the cords of anguish.

Whether a given prison is a place of extra torture or merely one at the ordinary dead-level of wretchedness, must of course largely depend upon the local governor, whose orders must be obeyed, be they just or unjust. A Kaid in the interior, when he was going out riding one day, commanded that a man should be beaten. On his return, finding that life was still in him, he ordered that they should continue to flog the wretched victim whilst he him-

¹ A case of a mother being arrested in place of her son was known to have occurred about two years ago.

self went off to pray in the mosque. The prisoner died. The same inhuman ruler had a man, whose real offence was too great friendliness to foreigners, chained to a wall in an upright position in such a manner that he could neither lie down nor rest in any way. This Kaid, who succeeded his father as governor, doubtless inherited a disposition to cruelty, for the parent was so hated that he was killed by his own people. Inflammable oil was poured over him, and he was burnt alive.

It might well be said that I have written enough of horrors, but I cannot leave off without alluding to those of the camp prisons. If a tribe be in revolt and refuses to pay tribute, soldiers are sent to bring them into subjection, who carry off large numbers of prisoners, hundreds at a time. If the prisoners are to be confined in places at no great distance, they are marched along in chains; otherwise, thus fettered, they are mounted on camels or donkeys, four together on the larger or two together on the smaller animals. When the unfortunate men are set down, an iron collar is fastened round each throat and they are chained together. So great are the tortures of these journeys, especially in summer time, that it has been calculated that a third or even a half may die on the way. As it is necessary to prove that none of the prisoners are lost, the heads of those who have perished are cut off, and preserved in salt, so that these ghastly trophies may be conspicuously exposed to view. If, by some mischance, a head is missing, they will even cut off a soldier's head to make up the number. Such a transaction seems almost incredible; but I am assured it is the case, and in a barbarous country like this life is of no value, and one can be easily substituted for the other.

And now I may turn from the relation of these horrors to the more pleasing subject of considering what has been done towards diminishing the sufferings of the unhappy prisoners, and especially in releasing innocent persons. In this respect a lady's name stands perhaps first and foremost. Miss Charlotte Hanbury, who died last October, for a number of years undertook long and fatiguing journeys, and devoted time and money to this cause. Accompanied by a Syrian to serve as guide and interpreter, she went about Morocco, and when in England she did her best to keep in touch with the work amongst the Moorish prisoners, aided by her Syrian helper. The North African Mission has had its workers scattered about the cities on the coast of Morocco, and also notably at Fez; and the mere presence of benevolent Europeans is calculated, in some slight degree, to check the stream of cruelty, and hundreds of persons have been rescued by the intervention of philanthropic persons of various nationalities. Also they have helped to make the prisons situated in towns on or near the coast a little better, and notably that at Tangier.

At the instance of Sir Arthur Nicolson, the present British Minister, a memorial signed by all his diplomatic colleagues in charge of legations in Tangier was sent to the Sultan of Morocco, calling attention to the lamentable state of the prisons and to

the necessity of reform. The result was that, at any rate for a time, there was some improvement in the more accessible places of confinement. The American Minister is now about to go to Morocco city on a mission to the Sultan, and it is not unlikely that the subject of prison reform will be again touched upon. The Howard Association has on more than one occasion drawn the attention of the British Government to the state of the prisons in this land, and it has sought to improve the condition of the unhappy inmates by sending round a circular letter to the governors. A member of this charitable society is now again about to visit Moorish prisons, as he has done on former occasions; and it is owing to his instrumentality and that of another gentleman greatly interested in this subject, possessing personal knowledge of its horrors, that I have been able to glean information concerning prison life. Reference may here be made to the labours of a former Minister, Sir William Kirby Green, who was a true friend to the Moors; and it was a most fortunate circumstance for them that his widow decided to remain in Morocco, where during long years she has earned the blessings of the unfortunate. So too have many others, and happily they are too numerous for me to mention their names, even if I were acquainted with them. Charity brings its own reward, and does not require the praise of man.

Before a man can be released from a Moorish prison, it is necessary to fee the gaolers, who have no regular pay, and if food has been given, the cost has to be refunded, consequently the longer a possibly innocent man has been imprisoned the more difficult it becomes for him to obtain his liberty. What has been the result of these labours? Much, very much, in individual cases, when innocent persons have been restored to home and family, but, alas! very little when compared with the mass of unnecessary misery prevailing in a corrupt country. Gold has in all lands more power than it ought to possess, but in Morocco it may be said to rule the country. It appoints governors and deposes them; it opens the doors of prisons and shuts them. A son attempted in one instance to depose his own father, and to become governor in his stead. For this purpose he offered 100,000 dollars. The father was carried off in chains, but saved himself by contriving to procure a still larger sum, so that he could be reinstated.

A strange and complicated story was related to me the other day, illustrating how persons come to be confined within prison walls. The outline of the story is as follows. A man in the employment of an American gentleman accidentally rode over an old woman and injured her. This occurrence caused much regret, and remedies were sent to the sufferer but were not made use of. The servant was in great danger of imprisonment, but the employer got hold of the son of the injured woman, and discovered that he was a good fellow and willing to overlook the offence. Knowing the

peculiarities of the country, the gentleman persuaded the man to sign a document absolving the servant from blame. The affair thus appeared to be happily ended. Far from it. The American in course of time received a hasty summons; two women had come with bitter complaints about the man who had caused the accident. It turned out that they were the sisters of the individual who had signed the paper and forgiven the injury. Inquiries were made for him. He was nowhere to be found. Too well acquainted with Moorish justice (?), the gentleman sought for the missing man in the right place, and found him, where he expected, in prison. The next proceeding was to try and get him out again, and an interview with the Bacha was requisite. This worthy spoke out very plainly when refusing to give up the offender. Providence had made it most easy for him to arrest a careless man who possessed something like 600 dollars. The other fellow by his inconsiderate signing of the paper had deprived him of the opportunity of obtaining what was required. He must therefore remain in prison. The governor assured his visitor by all that was holy that his decision could not be altered; but the Oriental is not lacking in the wisdom of the serpent, and knows that it is not well to stand out too long against the foreigner who has his country to back him up, and the inoffensive man was let out for a time, probably with the intention of recapturing him when an opportunity occurred. But this chance for the Bacha's revenge was lost by the fact that a post was immediately found for him at a consulate, and when under foreign protection the man could not be touched.

The Tangier prison is so far open to inspection that visitors may go and peep through the small opening in a strongly barred door, guarded by handsome soldiers in their long picturesque blue cloaks. This place of confinement, owing to European influence, may be regarded as a model one for Morocco; and as I looked through the hole there seemed at first sight to be nothing harrowing, though the stench which came up was very trying, and sufficient, one would imagine, to breed fever. What the state of the subterranean prisons in the country must be like, where hundreds of men are confined without light or ventilation, I leave to imagination! In the Tangier prison I saw the men squatting on the ground making baskets. As thus seen from a distance there was nothing to show that they were prisoners. Presently there was a clanking of chains, and a much more wretched-looking individual made his appearance. Whether a man is to be fettered with these heavy irons depends not upon his crime, but upon his ability to pay the soldiers. Afterwards a number of ragged-looking objects came to view; but the most miserable are often hidden away in the recesses of their place of captivity. A man who was permitted to enter on this occasion said that there were two men there apparently dying. A man confined in the prison had lately received 1,000 lashes for speaking against the Governor. Eight soldiers were said to have been employed in beat-

ing him. A still heavier punishment was reported to have been inflicted on a man who was pointed out to us.

If such terrible punishments are inflicted in what may be regarded as one of the best prisons, what may not be done elsewhere? On leaving this abode of misery a strange scene took place before our eyes. A woman came up to the prison with tears in her eyes. She related that her son, who with another man was concerned in a quarrel, was shut up. Her story was listened to with a compassionate ear by one of our party. He kindly produced sufficient money, a dollar (about three shillings) which he thought was enough to procure the release of the two men, though he considered that the men themselves, if they had had to make the bargain, would have had to pay more. The coin had a magical effect, bolts were unbarred, and in no time the prisoners were released. A little more bargaining concerning the price of this deliverance ensued. A little more had to be paid, and a small present given to the soldiers. Then the prisoners and their releaser all went on their way. Truly if Moorish so-called justice did not involve frightful suffering it would be most entertaining to the onlooker.

The remains of barbarism in this twentieth century, and in such close proximity to Europe, as represented by prison life in Morocco, is doubtless mainly occasioned by national jealousy. If one great European Power makes a step in advance, the other looks with envious eye on what is being done in a veritable political Naboth's vineyard. Might not politics, with all the strife and hatred which they often engender, be for once in a way set aside, and humanity be allowed to reign supreme? The action of Sir Arthur Nicolson and his colleagues was productive of some reform, if only for a time; might not some continuous action be productive of greater good?

As a woman, and as one who professes to understand nothing about the politics of Morocco, but who is interested in suffering humanity, it seems to me not an impossibility to establish a Committee, representative of various nationalities, to aid the prisoners. The Moors would be likely to regard it with respect, as they would suppose that its members would have the support of their respective Governments—and so I trust they would in course of time. This Committee should appoint men chosen with a view to their humanity, high principle, tact, and judgment, whose business it would be to go about the whole country visiting prisons, calling attention to glaring abuses, and obtaining, as far as possible, the release of those who have committed no crime. I feel so strongly that such action might be productive of a great mitigation of suffering that I would gladly hold myself responsible for the salary of one of these inspectors. It seems to me that it would be little short of a crime for anyone with means to assist, like myself, after having been brought face to face with the horrors of prison life in this unhappy country, to pass by on the other side, leaving the wretched sufferer alone in his anguish.

M. J. MEATH.

THE RECRUITING QUESTION

A POSTSCRIPT TO THE ARMY DEBATE

THE big debate on 'Army reform' is now a matter of history, and following the usual custom, the Government has had the last word. This is only right and proper, as far as the House of Commons is concerned, but I think it is also desirable that the unofficial military critic should be allowed to add a postscript. I therefore propose in these few pages to deal very briefly with the Government's attitude towards the recruiting problem; which, as cannot too often be pointed out, is the real *crux* of any scheme of Army reform.

The Front Bench utterances on this subject during the recent debate were so remarkable that I think it well to reproduce their most striking passages. Amongst these the palm must be awarded to Mr. Balfour's airy and amazing pronouncement:

I hope I shall be pardoned if I dismiss with extreme brevity one topic which has been often referred to in this debate, and that is the difficulty of recruiting. . . . It is not because I think it is unimportant, but because I think it is not raised by the scheme of my right hon. friend.

In other words, the problem of getting the men had nothing whatever to do with the Government's proposal to form six army corps, and it was probably not 'in order' to even discuss such irrelevant matter. There is something about this ruling that recalls Lewis Carroll at his best, and indeed I may say in passing, there are many points of resemblance between Parliament and 'Wonderland.'

Again, Mr. Wyndham, in discussing the same point, said, 'It is, after all, the *design* of your house that is important. The *materials* are of less consequence.' This may be so, of course; but I doubt if the argument would greatly appeal to a builder, and personally I would prefer to be sure of my bricks before approving the architect's design. The bricks in this case are the men, and in any great scheme of Army reorganisation the means of providing the men must surely be an indispensable preliminary.

Mr. Balfour and Mr. Wyndham apparently do not think so, but Mr. Brodrick and Lord Stanley take a somewhat different line.

They admit that the men are necessary, but contend that they will be forthcoming, and that the present inducements are sufficient to attract the requisite recruits. This is an intelligible basis for argument, though their conclusion is by no means borne out by the actual facts of the case. The most unanswerable of these facts is the 'Annual Report of the Inspector-General of Recruiting'—just issued—and I would strongly advise all those who are interested in the future of the Army, and who have not read this significant document, to do so without delay. (It should particularly be remembered that this Report deals with a period during the whole of which the country was engaged in a great war, and consequently that the conditions were exceptionally favourable to recruiting.) From it we learn that the physical standard for recruits of the regular Army was again lowered last year; and yet, in spite of this, over 30 per cent. of the recruits accepted were *below* the reduced standard. The percentage of rejections 'for want of physical development' has, moreover, steadily fallen from 21.6 per cent. in 1896 to 11.1 per cent. in 1900. During this same period, the annual number of desertions has risen from 3,357 in 1896 to 6,378 in 1900.

These are rather disheartening figures, and the accompanying opinion of the Inspector-General is anything but encouraging. He says: 'Recruiting for the infantry of the Line cannot be considered satisfactory, as in spite of the impetus given to recruiting by the war, the actual number of recruits enlisted for the infantry is 241 less than in 1899. The increase in the number of infantry battalions has, therefore, in spite of the reduction of the standard of height by half an inch (down to five feet three inches), not been met by an increased influx of infantry recruits.' And again: 'The situation from the recruiting point of view cannot, as a whole, be considered satisfactory. In spite of the war, recruiting for the infantry has not met the demand.' This is the official opinion of the highest responsible authority, and he is not likely to have erred on the side of pessimism.

A supplement to this Report, issued during the progress of the Army debate, was the basis of much jubilation on the part of Mr. Brodrick and Lord Stanley, as showing that 12,810 recruits had been obtained for the regular Army during the first three months of this year. This is a large number, undoubtedly, and possibly in excess of our normal requirements; but it must also be observed that over 4,000 of this total were 'specials,' i.e. below the minimum standard, whilst the Militia recruiting for these same three months shows a falling-off of nearly 2,000 from the normal. It must also be noticed that the total number of recruits obtained is over 5,000 less than in the corresponding period of last year—although the war is still in progress.

It is difficult to see why these statistics should appear so

satisfactory to the Secretary of State for War, but it has been said that statistics can be made to prove anything, and they are dreary reading at best. I will therefore leave them for the present, and come to a point with which they do not deal, and which is infinitely more important than any fluctuations in figures. I mean, to the *quality of the individual recruit*, and this is a matter upon which any civilian can form a correct judgment without any technical knowledge. All that is needed is a half-hour's visit to any of our recruiting depôts, and I would especially recommend the curious to look in at St. George's Barracks, the chief recruiting station for London and the most important in the kingdom. It is situated behind the National Gallery, and the only approach to it is down a squalid alley which leads to a dismal yard and a forbidding-looking barrack. The very appearance and atmosphere of the place are calculated to chill martial ardour and to discourage decent applicants, and yet it is through this slum that at least one-fifth of all our recruits have to reach the British Army.

Inside this prison-like structure may be seen, at almost any hour, representative samples of the Imperial recruit of the period. By far the greater number of them are poor, half-starved, unintelligent boys, who eagerly claim to be at least eighteen, but who strip like seventeen or less. Their immaturity is painfully obvious, but three out of every four applicants are accepted 'as soldiers of the King,' and it is to their hands that we are entrusting the military defence of the greatest Empire that the world has ever seen. It would be ludicrous if it were not so tragic in its possibilities of disaster. Besides which it is a great waste of money, because less than 47 per cent. of these boys ever serve their full time and pass into the Reserve whilst the remaining 53 per cent. are completely lost to the country after an expensive training and a few years' inefficient service. This wastage is the most appalling result of the present system of recruiting, and at a very conservative estimate at least 10,000 men disappear annually from the ranks of the Army, for no valid cause beyond moral or physical unfitness. The pecuniary loss to the nation from this cause alone is well over 1,000,000*l.* per annum, and in my opinion might almost entirely be obviated if mature men of a good class were enlisted in the first place.

This brings me to my fundamental contention that the intelligent and mature man of good antecedents is not only incomparably the better soldier, but is much the cheaper in the end. This fact was clearly recognised by Cromwell, whose army was

¹ In recruiting for the United States army, only one out of every four applicants is accepted, as compared with three out of every four in England. This point was completely ignored by Mr. Brodrick when he stated that in the United States only one soldier was needed for every 700 of the population, whilst in England we needed one soldier for every 100 of the population.

probably the finest in quality that has ever been seen in this country. Macaulay thus describes it:—

The Army was very different from any that has since been seen among us. . . . The pay of the private soldier was much above the wages earned by the great body of the people, and the ranks were accordingly composed of persons superior in station and education to the multitude.

. . . In war this force was irresistible. . . . From the time that the Army was remodelled to the time when it was disbanded, it never found, either in the British Islands or on the Continent, an enemy who could stand its onset.

It is a favourite contention nowadays that the physique of the fighting man is of ever-diminishing importance, and as long as a man is strong and sound this is perfectly true; but on the other hand, the quality of intelligence is of ever-increasing importance. Indeed, it is difficult to exaggerate the value of intelligence in modern fighting. This was especially brought home to me whilst serving with the United States army in the Spanish-American war.

The American regular comes from a good class, and is a much better man, physically and intellectually, than the average British soldier. On service he exhibits an astonishing amount of independence and resource. Thanks to an enlightened policy of musketry training, with an annual allowance of over 400 rounds to keep his hand in, he is a remarkably good shot, and he has a positive genius for taking or making cover. At the battles round Santiago de Cuba, I was much struck by his power of initiative, and by his calm independence of his officer. If the latter was wounded or killed, the American private was, of course, exceedingly sorry, but was never at a loss as to what to do or as to how to continue the advance. (I am referring, of course, to the Regular troops, and not to the Volunteers who played such a prominent part in the war.) I remember seeing the '7th Infantry' at El Caney lose over a third of its strength in a very few hours' fighting; but the men, so far from being demoralised thereby, seemed rather elated than otherwise. It was, moreover, quite a common occurrence to see a couple of privates, with or without a non-commissioned officer, sent off on an extended reconnaissance, and, on their return, they would give a clear and intelligent account of everything they had seen. How many of our private soldiers or non-commissioned officers would be up to doing this? I have no desire to institute odious comparisons, but the subject is so important that everyone should know the truth; and, as a striking contrast to what I have above described, I will quote from a letter which I have just received from an officer of experience, who is commanding a Mounted Infantry corps in South Africa. . . .

He writes:

I cannot help admiring the Boers' way of fighting. They are not so helpless and foolish as our gutter-bred town's boys. One thing only can the British Tommy do, and that is to walk straight to hell in line—if his officers go in front. But this widely-extended and semi-independent fighting beats him altogether.

It is with great reluctance that I have sketched this glaring contrast, to the disadvantage of our own men, but until the truth is realised by the British 'man in the street,' the evil will not be rectified.

Perhaps I should here interpolate that the American army as an entity is by no means deserving of unqualified praise. Its organisation is in most respects far inferior to ours; but the individual American soldier is, I believe, the best in the world, and for the simple and sole reason that he is paid better and treated better than any other. It is very difficult in this world to get anything good without paying the market price for it, and the United States Government is humdrum enough to recognise that fact. Our Government takes a more original view. It says in effect: 'The proper pay of a British soldier is one shilling a day. It has stood at this figure for over a century, and the fact that all other wages in the labour market have doubled in that time is interesting but irrelevant. We are aware, of course, that none but immature boys or derelict men could be attracted by this rate of pay; but as long as we can scrape together a precarious supply of these, what need to go further?' The fact that in all other trades an increase of wages brings a better class of workman has no bearing upon Army recruiting, and the American experience is probably misleading.

Mr. Brodrick has expressed his opinion that 'the American analogy may be pressed too far,' and I am well aware that a hobby may sometimes be ridden to death. But common sense is not a hobby, nor is it an American invention.

Mr. Brodrick has himself admitted: 'We want more independence and more individuality amongst the men'; but those qualities can only be found in a higher class of man, and that higher class can only be secured by paying better wages. This fact is so patently obvious that it scarcely admits of argument, and it is simply begging the whole question for the Financial Secretary to contend that an extra ninepence a day 'would not prove effective.' This is a mere assertion which runs contrary to all experience in every walk of life. Mr. Brodrick was wiser in his frank admission that he could not suggest raising the pay so long as he was able to fill up the ranks without. If he were really filling them up with grown and effective men, this attitude would be perfectly sound, and there would be no justification for risking any extra expense. But my contention is that the present system of enlisting immature boys is exceedingly costly and wasteful, whilst the securing of mature and efficient men, by an increase in the pay, would not only be the truest economy in the end, but would involve little if any extra expense. This was the whole sum of my argument, and Lord Stanley and Mr. Brodrick were not quite fair in their methods of handling it during the debate.

They only put forward and discussed the debit side of the balance-sheet, and ignored the credit side altogether. That is to say, they corroborated my figures in estimating the gross nominal cost of increasing the soldiers' pay; but then, avoiding my main contention that this total would be practically offset by the savings from increased efficiency and the reduction of ineffectives, they accused me of wishing to add some $3\frac{1}{2}$ millions to the Estimates. Of course I advocated nothing of the kind, as a glance at my letter, published in the *Times* of the 7th of May, will clearly show. In that letter I set forth some careful, and very conservative, calculations, which I will not here repeat, but which led up to the conclusion that probably 3,000,000*l.* a year could be saved by merely abolishing that portion of our present paper Army which is admittedly ineffective. My concluding remark on the subject was: 'The actual balance-sheet could only be elaborated by actuarial experts; but, neglecting the priceless advantage of increased morale and efficiency, I cannot doubt that their calculations would show that the proposed increase in the pay of the soldier would not necessarily mean an increased burden upon the Imperial Exchequer.'

This contention may of course seem wholly unspun to the officials of the War Office, but it is scarcely fair to ignore the fact that it was the backbone of my argument. However, my individual opinions are of very little importance; and my only excuse for bringing them forward again is that I know them to be shared by many wiser people, who have argued these very points over and over again, in a far more able manner, but most of whom had no opportunity of taking part in the recent Army Debate. Neither they nor I have expressed the smallest desire to see any increase in our enormous military expenditure, nor are we actuated by any merely philanthropic desire to increase the pay of a deserving body of men. But we do strongly object to the present waste of money on inefficient paper soldiers, and to the notoriously false economy of attempting to underpay labour.

An ingenious official argument is that, as we succeed in getting a certain small proportion of mature and efficient men at the present rate of pay, it would be most extravagant to pay them any more. So it would, if we get enough of them; but they are a mere fraction of the whole, and mostly represent the derelicts of the population who are driven by starvation to accept any terms that are offered, and who bear no sort of resemblance to our average type of recruit.

Another official argument, which was first disclosed to an astonished House of Commons in the course of the recent debate, was that the terms now offered to the British soldier are equivalent to 30*s.* a week. I will not attempt to speculate as to how this dizzy total was arrived at, but surely it is sufficiently disproved by its effect upon the working classes. Does it not stand to reason and

common sense, if the soldier's living were anything like as good as this, that it would prove an irresistible bait to the young men of the working classes, to the vast majority of whom such terms would be relative wealth? 'The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and for purposes of this argument it is sufficient to note that the present inducements held out to the soldier, however alluring in theory, are in practice insufficient to attract any but callow boys and a few desperate men. This being the case, it is ridiculous to gird at the cost of higher pay, even if it were not more economical in the end. On this point the official attitude is inexplicable, unless, as the *Times* suggests, the War Office really believes that 'one shilling a day is one of the fundamental laws of nature, or one of the eternal principles of the Cardwell system.'

The average man of business will, I think, take a more elastic view of this elementary problem. He knows that if he wants to buy a hat he has to pay the market price for it, and that no sane hatter would accept his plea that he does not care to pay more than half the proper figure. From this he will readily deduce that if the State wishes to buy a good class of soldier it will have to pay the market price, and that the working man cannot be hypnotised by the antiquarian charm of 'one shilling a day,' even if it does represent a fundamental or eternal principle.

I will not attempt to labour this question of pay any further; its importance is self-evident. But I hasten to add that it does not contain the whole solution of the problem. It must be concurrent with better conditions of barrack-life, suitable to the better class upon which we desire to draw. In this direction I do not think that the 'American analogy can be pushed too far'; and, to do Mr. Brodrick justice, I think he is fully alive to the importance of improving the attractiveness of the soldier's life. He has already held out a promise of certain distinct improvements, and I have every confidence that this important side of the question will be dealt with in a sympathetic spirit.

I fear, however, that when it comes to financial amelioration of the soldier's lot the cloven hoof is shown again, and that there is no intention of dealing with the substantial grievance of 'stoppages.' There are certain stoppages, for recreative and other purposes, to which no exception can be taken; but there is another category of vexatious stoppages, such as for upkeep of outfit, hair-cutting, and the like, which are bitterly resented by the soldier, and which are a real obstacle to recruiting. To abolish these altogether would only cost the State some £00,000*l.* per annum, and this outlay would be more than compensated for by the increased popularity of the Service.

I have now endeavoured to recapitulate the chief arguments in favour of a more liberal policy of recruiting, and I am confident that

in doing so I am backing a winning cause. The solution of the recruiting problem is an indispensable preliminary to making any reorganisation really effective, and as long as it remains unsolved the 'dry bones' of Mr. Brodrick's scheme cannot be 'clothed with flesh and blood.' Moreover, it is a problem which will push itself to the front with ever-growing insistence, and when the war is over it must engross the attention of the War Office, to the exclusion of almost everything else. In the meantime I only wish to again emphasise the fact that this recruiting question is not a technical military matter, intelligible only to experts, but a plain common-sense question, which can be understood by any man or woman who is possessed of ordinary business instinct. This is an important point to realise, as the problem will eventually have to be solved, not by any stroke of statesmanship, but by the good common sense of the people.

ARTHUR H. LEE.

LAST MONTH

No one can have mixed freely in London society during the past month without becoming conscious of one fact—that is, that men of all ranks and conditions, and of all shades in politics, are sick of the war and are longing for some signs of its approaching close. If this feeling of intense and almost painful weariness were accompanied by any indication of a weakening in the resolve to carry the conflict through to the end, I should avoid any reference to it in these pages. But the friends of the Boers need not comfort themselves with the idea that because there is this general yearning for peace there is any intention of abandoning the struggle before its fruits have been secured. One may therefore refer freely to the prevailing mood without fearing that in doing so encouragement will be given to the national enemy. It is not, however, the natural weariness at the prolongation of the painful and costly struggle that calls for comment. It would be surprising if men were not weary of a war which has already lasted for months and almost for years, instead of for the mere weeks that were originally assigned for its completion. But what is surprising is the fact that so decided a feeling of pessimism with regard to the course of the campaign should be displayed in many different quarters. The frequency with which the confident hopes of the experts have been disappointed, and fresh vistas of apparently interminable effort opened up, so soon as any particular stage in the conflict has been accomplished, seems to have had a demoralising effect upon those who were originally to be counted among the optimists. Our newspapers, including those which were most warlike twelve months ago, have been openly despondent, and our politicians, though they may have kept silence in Parliament, have not concealed in their private conversation their feelings of gloom and depression. It is a new phase of public sentiment, and not a pleasant one, that is thus revealed to us. That there is any real justification for this surrender to pessimism I cannot pretend to discover. When men seek to justify it they do not refer to the despatches of Lord Kitchener or to any of the notorious facts of the situation. They cite the despondent letters and telegrams of the *Times* correspondent at Pretoria; or they

quote private communications from South Africa, written by soldiers who are suffering from a physical depression for which the hardships of an eighteen months' campaign sufficiently account; or they profess to know, 'on the highest authority,' that the cost of the war is greater than Ministers have admitted it to be, or that the condition of our troops in the field is the reverse of satisfactory. Whatever may be their process of reasoning, the result is that the month of May 1901, unlike the corresponding month of last year, has seen a wave of deep depression sweeping over the public mind. A year ago we were riding on the crest of the storm of popular enthusiasm, and had been carried to almost delirious heights of self-exaltation by the close of the siege of Mafeking and the advance upon Pretoria. This year we seem to have fallen into an opposite and an equally unjustifiable extreme.

The sudden change is not very creditable either to our fortitude or our good sense. The process of wearing down the Boer resistance is unquestionably a tedious one; but that it is being accomplished and that every day brings us nearer to the moment when the last remnants of organised opposition will have disappeared, cannot be disputed. Indeed, as the month draws to a close the effects of the process of attrition in disintegrating the remaining forces of the enemy become daily more apparent, and even the Pretoria correspondent of the *Times* at last begins to speak hopefully as to the future. It cannot be said, therefore, that our public men are justified in their gloomy view of the situation. What truth there may be in the story, widely spread and generally accepted, that differences of opinion prevail even in the Cabinet on the question of the war, outsiders cannot pretend to say. It is, however, certain that the pessimists are to be found in the ranks of the Ministry as well as elsewhere. The point of difference between the bulk of the Opposition, supported by no inconsiderable section of the Ministerialists, and the ardent adherents of a war policy, is being more and more clearly defined as time passes. The feeling is strong in many quarters that the main obstacle to the conclusion of peace is the question of amnesty, and those who want peace are urgent in calling attention to the historical precedents which tell in favour of a general forgiveness for a beaten foe. The impression prevails, more particularly in Liberal circles, that Lord Kitchener, if he had a free hand, would be able to arrive at a settlement with the Boers still in the field, and that he at least would be prepared to concede their demands so far as an amnesty for the Cape rebels was concerned. A different line of policy is popularly attributed to Sir Alfred Milner and the Colonial Secretary. The return of Sir Alfred Milner to this country, though his stay is to be short and most of his time is to be given to his much-needed rest, will almost inevitably lead to a clearing up of the situation. Ministers, if they are indeed

divided in opinion, will have to come to a decision in one way or another, while public opinion will be more fully enlightened than it has been hitherto on the merits of this vexed amnesty question. Upon the whole, despite the prevailing depression, it seems as though we were on the eve of a change in the general situation which can hardly fail to be gratifying to a nation that now longs with eagerness for the return of peace. The one condition upon which all reasonable men insist is that the terms of settlement should be such as to make any renewal of the conflict as difficult as possible. The establishment of the material supremacy of Great Britain in South Africa has been practically accomplished; the maintenance of that supremacy and of a system of equitable government alike for Boers and Britons are the tasks which have still to be completed. It is difficult to believe that they can long stand in the way of the realisation of the universal desire.

The shadow of the war has been perceptible in Parliament as well as in general society during the past month. At last we are beginning to realise what war means as a financial operation. Perhaps I ought to have laid stress upon this fact as one of the causes of the popular depression of which I have spoken. Certain it is that some politicians, largely interested in our commerce, who have hitherto been warm supporters of the war policy, are now to be counted among those who are most gloomy at the thought of a possible prolongation of the struggle. When the month began it seemed not impossible that the Budget proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer might lead to something like an industrial war in this country. The sugar duty, although it falls upon everybody, and is felt more particularly by the poor, has been acquiesced in with a gloomy resignation. But the export duty upon coal was made the subject of an agitation the like of which we have hardly seen in England since Mr. Lowe's match duty was destroyed by the clamour of the streets. The indignation of the coal-owners was not unnatural, and no one could be surprised at the vigour with which they opposed a proposal that was not only a new departure in our fiscal policy, but crude in itself and unfair in its incidence. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, although he had to admit that the case in favour of the exemption of running contracts from the new duty was unanswerable, stood to his guns, and refused to yield to the angry pressure of the mine-owners. The mine-owners by themselves, rich and powerful though they may be, would not have caused the Chancellor of the Exchequer much anxiety; but the agitation assumed a different aspect when for once the working miners joined hands with the mine-owners, and made common cause with them against the new imposition. The contention of the pitman was that the export duty upon coal would restrict trade, and that its natural consequence must be a reduction in the output of our coalfields.

So strongly were the men impressed with this idea that a movement sprang up among them in favour of a general cessation of work as a protest against the Budget proposal. • Such a step, if it had been taken, would have been disastrous to the commercial interests of the country, and would have caused serious loss and inconvenience to the whole community. It would, at the same time, have applied to the Government a pressure distinctly illegitimate in its character. Whatever might be the defects of the Budget scheme, it was clearly wrong to attempt to remedy them by applying a severe measure of coercion, not to Ministers, but to the country at large. Yet it seemed at one time during the month as though this disaster were impending. Happily, the influence of some of the most notable leaders of the men, among whom Mr. Burt stands out in honourable pre-eminence, and the good sense of the rank-and-file, led to the adoption of a wise decision, and the proposed strike was abandoned. With it passed away for the time the risk of a form of social war new to this country and most dangerous in its character. Since then the House of Commons has been engaged in a discussion of the fiscal policy of his Majesty's Ministers upon the amendment of Sir Henry Fowler, to which I must make further reference on a later page. There is, however, no longer any reason to suppose that Ministers will suffer defeat in connection with the Budget of 1901. The real *crux* of the financial situation is to be found in the fact, mentioned in these pages last month, that the great burden of taxation now laid upon us does not represent the extraordinary war expenditure of the country, but its normal expenditure under the Government now in office.

The debates in Parliament during the month have been of great and varied interest. The scheme of Army Reform propounded at the beginning of the Session by Mr. Brodrick has now received the stamp of parliamentary approval. • That approval, however, has been given in such a fashion as to prove that it is nothing more than an expression of the fidelity of the Tory party to its leaders. Mr. Brodrick's proposals have been literally riddled with adverse criticisms, and, except their author, no one has been found to show any enthusiasm for them. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who led the parliamentary opposition to Mr. Brodrick's measure, was sneered at by the *Times*, as well as by some supporters of the Government, as being a mere partisan who criticised the new proposals with an eye to the advantage of his own party only. Nothing could be more ill-timed or unfair than this sneer. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman may possibly, in some of his political actions, expose himself to those cheap gibes in which his journalistic critics indulge with wearisome reiteration; but those who are acquainted with his career know perfectly well that he is an acute and well-informed, as well as serious, critic of our military system. There is no one in the House

of Commons at this moment who can speak with higher authority upon any subject connected with the War Office and with Army organisation, and it is scarcely wise for ministerial writers to expose their own ignorance by professing to discover in Sir Henry's criticisms nothing more than the carplings of a political partisan. The leader of the Opposition hit a score of more or less obvious defects in Mr. Brodrick's scheme. He was not, however, alone in doing so. The majority of the amendments to the Army Bill were in the names of supporters of the Government, and it was from the ministerial side of the House that the most pungent criticism of the measure emanated. But with all its glaring defects, Mr. Brodrick's scheme holds the field, and the very men who were most bitterly opposed to it among the Service members allowed fidelity to their party to override their convictions when the time came to go into the division lobby. To the outsider it seems that Mr. Brodrick's plan has at least one commendable feature. It is a measure of decentralisation, and until our Army system has been decentralised it can never be really amended. But, on the other hand, under this scheme the War Office is left untouched, and a thousand abuses which flourish in Pall Mall will continue to flourish as luxuriantly as ever. The cost, moreover, is great, and the results uncertain. The chief problems connected with our military system and the defence of the Empire are evaded, and no one,—not even Mr. Brodrick himself—can pretend that there is any approach to finality in the scheme. This being the state of the case, one may well ask whether the time has not arrived when the enlightened opinion of experts outside the House of Commons should be brought to bear upon the Government proposals. We are not rich enough in these days to be able to spend money upon mere experiments. We have to set the Empire on a business footing, and in order to do so we must make up our minds upon one or two questions of supreme importance with regard to our defensive system. These questions must be considered not merely by Parliament, but by the public out of doors before they can be settled satisfactorily. The debates on the Army Bill were marked by a personal episode which may have notable consequences. Mr. Winston Churchill, the youthful, but already distinguished, son of Lord Randolph Churchill, threw himself into the debate with great ardour in the character of the champion of that cause of administrative retrenchment and reform which was taken up by his father during his brief term of office as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Churchill sits on the Conservative benches, and professes a deep-seated loyalty to his party, but it is clear that he is not more of a conventional Conservative than was his father before him. One does not wish to attach too much importance to the first appearances in parliamentary debate of a young man whose ambition is not less marked than his ability; and due allowance must be made for the filial piety by which

Mr. Winston Churchill is manifestly inspired. But taking all this into account, there is something both remarkable and refreshing in the appearance upon the scene of such an advocate of doctrines that are for the moment neglected and despised. It is especially refreshing at a time when the cry that 'something must be done' is being raised on every side, and when there is the demand for increased expenditure which attends most ill-considered attempts to remedy evils of long standing, to hear one voice raised on the forgotten side of national economy. It is obvious to everybody that we have reached a crisis when partial measures of administrative reform may do more mischief than if we were to leave things alone; but it is the public, in other words the nation, that must make up its mind as to what it wishes to be done, and the enlightenment of the popular mind upon the problems that have now to be faced seems to be still more necessary than the passing of hasty and crude measures for increasing our Army or altering our system of military organisation. Mr. Brodrick's proposals will no doubt pass through the House of Commons with slight amendments, but no one can pretend that they are either complete or satisfactory, even when regarded from the point of view of the Army alone. Regarded from the higher and wider standpoint of the nation, they are almost ludicrously inadequate.

Another measure of importance has taken its place beside the Army Bill in the ministerial programme. This is the Education Bill. As yet it has not been criticised in detail, but popular opinion is curiously divided with respect to it. By some educationists it is regarded as being primarily a Bill for the suppression of School Boards, and it is blessed or cursed in accordance with the opinion men hold of those institutions. There are, however, educational authorities whose fidelity to liberal principles cannot be questioned who admit that the chief feature of the new Bill, the provision of a new authority for technical and secondary instruction, is sound. It seems a pity that Ministers, who have certainly not been fortunate hitherto with their educational measures, should have thought it necessary to bring in a Bill of this kind at a period of the Session when its passage is, to say the least, doubtful. The Cockerton judgment has made it imperative that some provision should be made for carrying on the secondary education which many of our School Boards have been giving. But this provision might have been furnished in a much simpler form than that of the Government proposals, and with a much greater chance of becoming law during the present Session. Ministers have certainly not lightened their task by this renewed attempt to deal with the problem of national education, their dealings with which have already aroused the jealousy and suspicion of all but the members of the clerical party.

The Civil List debate was short, and was marked by no notable

feature. The proposals formulated by the Select Committee to which the question of a provision for the maintenance of the Crown was referred were carried without any serious opposition. It is impossible for those who recall the agitations of bygone years not to see in this fact distinct and gratifying proof of the increased hold which the Crown has obtained upon the nation. Queen Victoria did more during her long and splendid reign to strengthen the foundations of the monarchy than the most warlike or most brilliant of her predecessors ever did. At the same time, one cannot ignore the fact that there is one section of the nation which does not share the otherwise universal sentiment with regard to the monarchy and the Monarch. The Irish members, under the leadership of Mr. Redmond, voted against the Civil List proposals, as they have consistently voted against all measures designed to strengthen the Crown or the lands of his Majesty's Administration. One episode of the month has brought into additional prominence the estrangement of the Irish Nationalist party from the general sentiment of Parliament. This was the debate upon the action of the executive in Dublin in seizing a particular issue of the paper called the *Irish People*. The reason of the seizure was the appearance in the journal of a cowardly and atrocious attack upon the personal character of the King. No attempt was made by any one sitting on the Irish benches to defend this abominable libel. On the contrary, it was admitted that the slander would have been inexcusable if directed against the humblest, instead of the most exalted, person in the realm. But the Irish members were apparently unable to divest themselves of the idea that action had been taken against the journal in question, not because it had outraged public decency, but because it was an Irish newspaper. It is a question whether the odious garbage of this particular print might not have been best treated with silent contempt; but there can be no question that the Irish Nationalist cause must suffer far more deeply from utterances of this kind than the person against whom they are directed. It is painful to see so many of the representatives from Ireland insisting upon claiming for themselves the position of pariahs, and even championing a cause with which they cannot avow any personal sympathy, in order to accentuate their state as self-appointed outcasts. It is the theory of a certain class of Irish politicians that the only way in which the British Parliament can be influenced is by Irish members making themselves as obnoxious as possible to the other sections of the House. One can only regret, for the sake of the Irish members themselves, that they should have carried this theory so far as to appear to differ from the rest of the world in their view of the slanders printed in the *Irish People*.

The return of Lord Salisbury to England has naturally increased the interest of political life. It is gratifying to know that the

Prime Minister has thrown off the effects of his recent indisposition, and is now so far restored to health as to be able to resume his usual place in public life. That he is no longer the exceptionally vigorous man whom we once knew is evident to all, but his remarkable speech at the dinner of the Nonconformist Unionists showed that he can still at times shake off the lethargy of advancing age, and address himself with much of his old spirit to the discussion of public affairs. His speech to his Nonconformist supporters was couched in an unusual tone of optimism. It might have been intended as a direct rebuke to those of his followers who have given way to that prevailing pessimism of which I spoke at the beginning of this article. Indeed, it was not obscurely hinted in one ministerial journal that he spoke as much for the benefit of some colleagues of his own in the Cabinet as for that of the public at large. His bold assertion that the South African war has revealed the strength of the British Empire, and has made it more improbable than ever that any other Power will attack us, has caused great irritation abroad. But it was less of a paradox than it appeared to be. Heaven knows our blunders throughout this war have been grave enough to discredit any Government, however strong; but the best judges among our neighbours on the Continent have admitted the fact that the misfortunes which attended our earlier operations in the campaign, and the terribly protracted character of that campaign in its latest phase, do not necessarily reflect upon the British Army. It is doubtful whether any European force would have fared better, while it is certain that no troops in the world could have faced the almost inconceivable difficulties that have confronted us in South Africa in a spirit of more resolute courage and determination. Lord Salisbury was, therefore, not without some reason for the remark by which some of his critics abroad profess to have been shocked, while the spirit of cheery optimism which animated his speech was all the more grateful to his fellow-countrymen because it was one which he so rarely displays. But Lord Salisbury's appearances in the House of Lords since his return have been less fortunate than his speech to the Nonconformist Unionists. Instead of optimism, we have had a listlessness and apathy, almost incomprehensible in a man occupying so great a position in the world. The most significant exhibition of this spirit was his almost petulant outburst on the subject of Temperance legislation. He seemed to be forgetful of the fact that public opinion, even within the ranks of his own party, has been moving strongly for years past in the direction of such reform, and that his own Government has given pledges on the subject. Lord Rosebery rallied him sharply in the House of Lords upon the mingled disdain and indifference with which he treated the appeals of the friends of Temperance, and upon the obstinacy with which he clung to old-world theories that have

long been discarded by the overwhelming majority of the public. But notwithstanding his indifference, amounting to a scarcely concealed hostility, he has been compelled to yield to the pressure put upon him, and has consented to the adoption by the Government of the Bishop of Winchester's Habitual Drunkards Bill. In spite of this concession he has made it clear to the public, however, that social reform is the last thing in which any Ministry of which he is the head can be expected to take the initiative. No more distinct indication of the fact that he recognises that his own term of service as one of the leaders of the nation is drawing to a close could well have been given.

Ministers have weathered the Budget storm more successfully than seemed likely a month ago; but their unpopularity is just as great as ever—especially among certain sections of their own followers. The faithful *Spectator* has devoted much valuable space to an exposure of their blunders that would have seemed almost unduly severe if it had proceeded from one of their most hostile critics; the talk of the Lobby ran wildly at one period during the last month upon the prospects of an immediate dissolution, while those who are seeking for an explanation of the decadence of the House of Commons seem of late to have found refuge in a simple formula that attributes the parliamentary dry-rot to the failure of Mr. Balfour as leader of the House. All these things are to be expected when a Ministry is in the sere and yellow stage of its existence. If there had been no General Election last autumn and no reconstruction of the Government we should naturally have looked for these signs of weariness on the part of the Ministerialists. What is surprising is the fact that we see them now, six months after a new Parliament has given an overwhelming majority to the Government, and after the Ministry itself has been reconstructed in the most approved fashion. It seems as though there were something distinctly artificial and unreal in the new lease of life which Ministers secured last September. The forces which always make for the disintegration and destruction of even the strongest Governments have apparently not been neutralised, have scarcely indeed been modified, by the dissolution of last autumn and the subsequent triumph of Ministers in the ballot-box. Moralists, whatever their party colour may be, will not feel unmixed sadness as they observe these proofs that the natural course of political affairs is not permanently affected, in this country at all events, by any parliamentary *coup d'état*, however clever and however successful for the moment it may appear to be.

The real secret of the strength of the Government remains what it was a month ago. Ministers are tolerated and supported, not because there is any passionate devotion to them on the part of the majority in the House of Commons, not even because there is any magnetic tie between the leader and the party, but because, to speak

quite plainly, men do not see how the existing Government is to be replaced. There is no alternative Administration. This is the truth which Mr. Herbert Gladstone stated in plain terms at a meeting in Leeds a few weeks ago, to the huge wrath and indignation of the average man in his party. Possibly in making this statement he violated the canon which defines the relations of a party Whip to the truth when that truth happens to be unpalatable to his political connection. But in any case every sensible Liberal knows that Mr. Gladstone's statement was a simple assertion of an indisputable fact, and it would be a good thing for the Opposition if the true significance of this fact could be realised. Whatever may have been the blunders and failures of the Government and however deplorable may be its weakness, it is the state of the Opposition which is the most serious feature of the political situation. There is something unnatural and almost unprecedented in the complete collapse of a party which is the official custodian of the great traditions of English Liberalism, and which ought at this moment to be in command of the support of at least a moiety of the electors of the country. I am well aware that it is regarded as almost treasonable for any Liberal writer or speaker to call attention to the miserable condition of his party in the House of Commons. The men who clamoured the other day for the resignation of his post as Whip by Mr. Herbert Gladstone because he had ventured to utter an unpalatable truth, will be just as angry with any independent Liberal who calls attention to the deplorable state of the party. But seeing that the weakness of the Opposition is one of the most serious features of our public life at the present moment, and that if events had run in the usual course the Liberal party ought now to have been in command of the Government of the country, the fear of the censure of one's fellow-Liberals is hardly a sufficient reason for keeping silence on this burning question.

It appears, judging by the talk one hears in political circles, as though the old days when the swing of the pendulum seemed to govern the course of affairs had passed away for ever. Even in 1892 the movement of public opinion in favour of the party in opposition was partial and slow, and since then it has ceased altogether. Not can it be truthfully said that there are any marked indications of an early change. The blunders and misfortunes of the Government are recognised by everybody, but as yet they have not affected the constituencies. The Monmouth election took place at the time when anger against the Chancellor of the Exchequer was at its height, and it was confidently expected that in a coal-producing district the Opposition candidate would have a certain and an easy victory. Yet in the event it was the Tory not the Liberal candidate who was chosen. In other directions one looks in vain for signs of any great movement in the constituencies such as invariably precedes a transference of power from one party to another. The Liberals in the

constituencies are showing the dogged tenacity of our race in the way in which they are sticking to their guns, and striving to regain their old supremacy. The National Liberal Federation is still buoyant and confident, and appeals as distinctly as ever to the old battle cries to which its members have so often rallied in the past. In the Lobby of the House of Commons there has been wild talk even within the past month of the defeat or resignation of Ministers, and sanguine Liberals have even dreamt for a moment of the possibility of forming that alternative Government which Mr. Herbert Gladstone declared to be impossible. It was said, indeed, at the beginning of May that for several evenings the chief topic of discussion in the smoking-room of the House of Commons was the person for whom the King would send when he received the resignation of his present advisers! Yet despite these things the broad fact remains that the Opposition is at this moment impotent. It can secure no substantial, no real victory over the Government, and Ministers in consequence may pursue their own way without fear of being called to account, no matter what errors they may commit.

How are we to account for this state of things? The war has, no doubt had something to do with it, for it has introduced a new fissure in the ranks of the Liberal party. But those who think that the war is mainly responsible for the distracted and disunited condition of the Opposition are undoubtedly mistaken. A political party has been divided before to-day on questions like that of the conflict in South Africa; but when agreed upon most other subjects, it has never found a difference of opinion, on one particular topic a bar to common action in the field of general politics. To-day we see that even when the members of the Opposition are most anxious to present a united front to the enemy, and when their opportunities seem to be most favourable, they cannot put their full force into the division-lobby; while they can hardly take a decided step in any direction without an accompaniment of mutterings of discontent and disaffection from those who are supposed to be supporters of the common policy. The past month has furnished the country with a singular instance of the way in which the Opposition is reduced to impotence by the conduct of its own members. The debate upon our financial condition as revealed by the Budget was raised upon an amendment which had been entrusted by the Opposition leaders to the very capable hands of Sir Henry Fowler. There is, by common consent, no one on the front Opposition bench, and probably no one in Parliament, who can handle a great financial question with more force and lucidity than the former Secretary of State for India. That he should be chosen by the leaders of the Opposition to introduce a debate upon the national finances seemed not only natural but inevitable. Yet no sooner was his name

announced in connection with the amendment than a movement, obviously organised and artificial, was begun against him. The country was told that the Liberals in the House were shocked and aggrieved because Sir Henry had been selected to move an official amendment. His views upon the war were stated to be such that no real Liberal could possibly feel confidence in him, and it was not obscurely hinted that he was personally regarded with dislike and suspicion by all the 'advanced' section of the Opposition. This attempt to proscribe an ex-Cabinet Minister of the first rank, whose services in debate are second to those of no other member of his party, was obviously foolish and dishonest. There was, as a matter of fact, no foundation for the inspired newspaper attacks upon Sir Henry beyond that provided by a small clique of intriguers of advanced opinions and little influence. But when the gentlemen engaged in this movement saw that their attempt at proscription had recoiled upon their own heads, they did not abandon the attack, but only shifted their ground. It was explained, with much elaboration, that it was not with Sir Henry Fowler that people were dissatisfied, but with his amendment. That amendment did not deal with the question of the war—as though the war was a subject upon which the opinion of Parliament had never been expressed—and it was consequently impossible for this or the other section of the Opposition to support it. The result of these tactics was seen in the division-lobby, when the majority of the Government, on a motion in which the official Opposition challenged the policy of Ministers, was no less than 177. The Irish members, after a speech from Mr. Redmond, in which he proclaimed his warm sympathy with the Boers, and assailed Sir Henry Fowler with the malignant vituperation which is the stock-in-trade of Irish orators, abstained from voting, and more than a dozen members of the Liberal party took the same course. The history of Parliament records no more discreditable collapse than this.

The simple truth with regard to the Opposition is that for years past personal questions and personal rivalries have been permitted to assume an importance to which they have no claim, and that deliberate attempts have been made by men whose activity in intrigue is fortunately more conspicuous than their numerical strength, to proscribe those leaders who happened to be obnoxious to an extreme section. It is painful to have to write thus of a party with whose principles and traditions I am in full sympathy; but it is notoriously true and it ought to be said. Until the party can be freed from the burden of these personal rivalries and animosities, and can concentrate its strength upon its proper task—that of stating what it believes to be evil in the policy of the Government—must remain what it is at present, weak, discredited and disunited.

To blame the leaders of the party for this condition of affairs would be not only unfair but ridiculous. The most brilliant of parliamentary leaders would be paralysed by the kind of disaffection, the reckless insistence upon personal independence, that pervades a section of the Liberal Opposition to-day. It is for this reason, rather, than because there is a small minority upon the Liberal benches who believe that the South African war is a crime for which the sole responsibility rests with his Majesty's Government, that no alternative Administration is at present possible.

The month of May 1901 has witnessed at least one great event, the full significance of which cannot be revealed until the history of the newly born century is written. The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia has been opened in the name of King Edward by his son the Duke of Cornwall, and a new nation, with possibilities of development both material and moral so vast that the imagination can hardly picture them, has been started upon its career. Here one must be content merely to chronicle the fact. Of the splendid enthusiasm shown by the people of Melbourne not only in their welcome to the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall but in their acclamation of the new Parliament, there is no need to speak. But those who may be inclined to regard this great movement in the organisation of the Empire with cynical eyes will do well to take note of the manner in which it has been received by foreign publicists. The birth of the Australian Commonwealth is universally regarded abroad as one of the greatest events of our era.

In the field of foreign affairs the month has witnessed no events of the first importance. The Chinese question has not yet been settled; and in the latest as in the earliest stages the chief obstacle to a solution has been the action of the Russian Government. After much negotiation the amount of the indemnity to be paid by China has been agreed to, the Chinese Government apparently being more liberal in its view of the amount due to those who have been the victims of its weakness and duplicity than some of the victims themselves. But the amount having been settled, a new difficulty has arisen in connection with the guarantee to be given for the payment of the indemnity, and it is here that the action of Russia has caused, and is likely to cause, delay. In the meantime Count von Waldersee is likely to return to Germany almost immediately. The dangers of the joint military occupation of Peking and places in its neighbourhood have been illustrated during the month by more than one 'incident,' which if not handled with delicacy and good feeling might easily have developed into a complication of the most serious kind. That there is any real improvement in the general situation in China, or that we are any nearer than we were twelve months ago to the solution of the great problems of the Far East, there is no reason to

FRE

French submarine boats, and invasion of England, 82-85
Frontier, Indian, policy of Lord Curzon, 709-714
Fyfe (H. Hamilton), *Mr. Sargent at the Royal Academy*, 1022-1027

GENTLEWOMEN, *Emigration for*, 601-610

German commercial, military, and scientific progress, 478, 479, 486, 1028-1082
German competition with British trade in East and South Africa, 630-637
Gibraltar, Our Offers to Surrender, 1012-1021
Giffen (Sir Robert), *The Standard of Strength for our Army: a Business Estimate*, 931-948
Giles (Herbert A.), *Encyclopadia Maxima*, 859-865
Göddrich-Freer (Miss A.), *Robert Browning the Musician*, 648-658
Gorst (Harold E.), *The Blunder of Modern Education*, 843-848
Green (Mrs. J. R.), *Our Boer Prisoners: a Suggested Object-Lesson*, 755-771
Grieg (Edvard), *Verdi*, 451-455

HALE (Colonel Lonsdale), *Sham v. Real Home Defence*, 248-267

Halifax, Viscount, *The Recent Anglo-Roman Pastoral*, 736-754
Harcourt (L. W. Vernon), *The Next Coronation*, 975-987
Harrison (Frederic), *Impressions of America*, 913-980
Hedley (John Cuthbert, Bishop of Newport), *The Catholic Doctrine of Indulgences*, 159-178; reply to, 296-306
Hereford (Bishop of), *Church Reform: Why not begin with the Parish?* 889-895
Hinks (Arthur R.), *Astronomical Laboratories*, 799-798
Holland submarine boats, 86-88
Holroyd, Maria, 500-513
Home Defence, Sham versus Real, 248-267, 406-415
Hooliganism, 84-89
Hospitals Commission, *The South African*, 398-405
Hospitals, *Doctors' n.*, 611-623
Hospitals, Field, 586, 587
Hospitals, *Relationship of, to Medical Schools*, 781-788
Hospitals, *Scientific Use of*, 57-68
Hospitals, *Commons, The*, 1004-1011
Hospitals, *Problem, The*, 794-804

LAW

Husbandry, Open-field, inclosures, and condition of labourers, 16-29
Hyde's (Douglas) Irish poems, 289-293

IMPERIAL *Civil Service, a Suggestion from Australia*, 445-450
India, Lord Curzon in, 708-718
Indian Civil Service, Australasian candidates for, 445-450
Indian Press, The Native, 817-828
Indulgence, Papal, for Josef Mayr, of Oberammergau, 174-176
Indulgences, The Catholic Doctrine of, 159-173
Indulgences, The Roman Catholic Doctrine of, 296-306
Industrial supremacy, British, American, and German rivalry for, 901-912, 1028-1033
Irish People, A Plea for the Soul of the, 285-295
'*Islam, The Sources of*,' 77-83; 864-866
Italian Drama and the death of Verdi, 451-455

JAPAN'S relations with Korea, 834-842

Jephson (Henry), *A Day of Purification*, 90-99
Jessopp (Rev. Dr.), *England's Peasantry—Then and Now*, 16-29
Joint Stock Companies, liability of directors and promoters, 638-647
Jones (Henry Arthur), *The Drama in the English Provinces*, 431-444
Juvenile crime, prevention of, 84-89

KAFFIRS and the labour question in South Africa, 367-376

Kebbel (T. E.), *Leaders of Opposition—before and after 1832*, 514-522
King Edward VII., accession of, 204, 205, 533-537
King's Civil List, The, 897, 898, 1069
King's coronation, The, ancient ceremonies, 975-987
King's Test Declaration, The, 698-707
Korea from the Japanese Standpoint, 834-842

LAND of Woe, A, 1050-1055

Language question in Ireland, 285-295
Last Month, 199-214, 530-544, 719-728, 889-900, 1064-1078
Law, Is it for the People or for the Lawyers? 858-873

LEE

- Lee (Arthur H.), *The Recruiting Question: a Postscript to the Army Debate*, 1056-1063
- Lespinasse (Mlle. de), her life and letters, 1038-1049
- Liberal party, divisions in the, 1078-1076
- Liberal view of current politics, 181-146
- Liberalism and the Imperial sentiment, 209-212
- Litigation, Costs of, need of reform, 859-873
- London as seen through American spectacles, 473-477
- London, A University for, 1033-1037
- Lord (Walter Frewen), *The Novels of Anthony Trollope*, 805-816; *Our Offers to surrender Gibraltar*, 1012-1021
- Love Letters, Some Real*, 1038-1049
- Low (Sidney), *Current Politics: a Conservative View*, 147-158; *Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century*, 487-499
- McCAUL (Miss Ethel), *Army Nursing*, 580-587
- Macdonell (John), *The Question of the Native Races in South Africa*, 867-876
- Macnamara (Dr. T. J.), *The Education Bill*, 998-1003
- Maharaja and Maharanee of Baroda, their daily life and travels, 215-225
- Mahood (Mrs. William), *The Modesty of Englishwomen*, 588-600
- Markham (Arthur B.), *The Economic Outlook in the Transvaal*, 226-239
- Martin (Sir Theodore), *Victoria the Good: a Sonnet*, 198
- Mayr (Josef) of Oberammergau and Papal Indulgences, 174-176
- Maxwell (Sir Herbert), *Military Training Schools for Lads*, 566-573
- Meath (Countess of), *A Land of Woe*, 1050-1055
- Medical research and clinical laboratories, 57-68
- Medical Schools and the scientific use of hospitals, 781-788
- 'Medical tyranny' and lay government of hospitals, 611-628
- Memorials to Queen Victoria, in Calcutta, 949-958, and in London, 959
- Midnight, December 1st, 1900*, 2-3
- Military Provident Fund, A*, 574-579
- Military Training Schools for Lads*, 566-573
- Militia Ballot, rifle clubs, and home defence, 406-415

PAR

- Militia, Volunteers, and Yeomanry for defence of Great Britain, 263-267, 879-888
- Milner (Sir A.), despatch on the War, 896, 896
- Modesty of Englishwomen, The*, 588-600
- Mohammedanism and Christian Missions, 77-83, 864-866
- Monarchy in the Nineteenth Century*, 487-499
- Moore (George), *A Plea for the Soul of the Irish People*, 285-295
- Moorish prisons, Horrors of, 1050-1055
- Morant (Lilian C.) and Papal Indulgence at Oberammergau, 174-176
- Morris (Prof. Edward E.), *The Imperial Civil Service: a Suggestion from Australia*, 445-450
- Muir (Sir William), his writings on Mohammedanism criticised, 77-83, and defended, 864, 865
- Music, Robert Browning's love of, and its influence on his works, 648-658

- NATAL, *Clearing*, 240-247
- National Theatre, The*, 772-780
- Native princes of India, Lord Curzon's attitude towards, 714-718
- Naval efficiency and submarine boats, 80-88
- Navy, British, its organisation contrasted with that of Germany, 416-430
- New Century, A, and an Old Riddle*, 7-15
- Nicaragua Canal Question, The, and the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty*, 100-115
- Nineteenth century, retrospective review of, 181-185

- OBERAMMERGAU, *Note on the Papal Indulgence at*, 174-176
- Oppenheim (L.), *Thornycroft's Mounted Infantry on Spion Kop*, 39-56; *Clearing Natal*, 240-247
- Opposition, Leaders of, before and after 1832*, 514-522

- PALMER (Rev. Dr. A. Smythe), *What were the Cherubim?* 832-847
- Papal Indulgences, 159-173, 174-176; 298-306
- Papal infallibility and the authority of the Episcopate, 786-784
- Parker (Gilbert), *'Australia for the White Man' again*, 829-833

PAR

- Parliament and politics at the close of the nineteenth century, 181-158
 Parliament, speeches of party leaders at opening of the session, 539-544
 Parliament, the Press, and English life as depicted by Anthony Trollope, 805-816
 Parliamentary procedure, Changes in, 1004-1011
 Parliamentary Test Declaration and the doctrines of the Roman Church, 698-707
 Parochial Church Councils as a step to Church Reform, 889-895
 Paul (Herbert), *The Roman Catholic Doctrine of Indulgences*, 296-306
 Peking, burning of the book-quarter, loss to Chinese literature, 659-665
 Phillips (Stephen), *Midnight, December 31st, 1900*, 2-6
 Photographic methods applied to astronomical measurement, 789-793
 Pioneers, *Our Race as*, 849-857
 'Pi-Pa-Ki, or San-Pou-Tsong,' 807-820
 Plays, Objectionable, and the Modesty of Englishwomen, 588-600
 Political retrospect and forecast of the old and the new century, 2-6
 Politics, *Current: A Liberal View*, 181-146; *A Conservative View*, 147-158
 Pansosby (Lady), *The Role of Women in Society*, 64-76
 Portrait-painting, Romney compared with Reynolds and Gainsborough, 528-529
 Pratt (Professor Hutcheson Stanley), 'Pi-Pa-Ki, or San-Pou-Tsong,' 807-820
 Poynter (Sir Edward J.), his design to illustrate the change of title of the Review, 1
 Priestley (Lady), *The Bacteria Beds of Modern Sanitation*, 628-629
 Professional and organised crime, how to stamp it out, 268-284
 Progress in religion and morals during the past century, 7-15
 Provincial drama, 451-444
 Prussia, *The First Queen of*, 666-678
 Purgatory, Penance, and Indulgences, 163-173, 174-176
 Purification, *A Day of*, 90-99
 QUEEN, *The—Last Month*, 199-214
 Victoria, death of, 197, 198, 205, 580-583
 Influence in restoring the form of monarchy, 487-499
 Victoria Memorial Hall in London, 949-959

SCO

Queensland and the Polynesian labour question, 829-833

- RAILWAYS of South African Republics as an asset towards cost of the war, 781-784
 Rawlings (B. Burford), *Doctors in Hospitals*, 611-623
 Recruiting Question, *The: a Postscript to the Army Debate*, 1056-1063
 Rees (J. D.), *The Native Indian Press*, 817-828
 Reform Bill of 1832, its influence on Parliamentary Opposition, 514-522
 Reformatories and the prevention of juvenile crime, 84-89
 Regimental Institutes and canteen reform, 874-878
 Regular Army, its objects and necessary strength, 931-948
 Reichstadt (Duc de, son of Napoleon I.) and Metternich, scenes from *L'Aiglon*, 988-997
 Reid (Sir Wemyss), *Current Politics: a Liberal View*, 181-146; *Last Month*, 199-214, 530-544, 719-728, 889-900, 1064-1078
 Roberts (Lord), *Free Trade in the Army*, 177-196
 Robertson (Edmund), *The Admiralty and Submarine Boats*, 80-88; *The Civil List*, 377-388
 Rodin (*Augustin*), 698-697
 Roman Forum, *Strata in the*, 461-471
 Rosebery (Lord) and the Liberal party, 146, 150-155
 Rosand's (M.), 'L'Aiglon,' *Three Scenes from*, 988-997
 Royal Academy, *Mr. Sargent at the*, 1022-1027
 Royal Army Medical Corps, its shortcomings and its grievances, 396-405
 Russell (Major-General Frank S.), *Our Last Effort for a Voluntary Army: a Military View*, 555-565
 ST. CLAIR-TISDALL (Rev. W.)
 'The Sources of Islam,' 364-366
 St. Helena, Boer prisoners at Deadwood Camp, 755-771
 Salisbury (Lord) and his new Ministry 138-144, 147, 148, 152-154
 Sanitation, *Modern, Bacteria Beds of*, 624-629
 Sargent's (Mr.) pictures at the Royal Academy, 1022-1027
 Scientific Use of Hospitals, 57-63
 Scott (Rev. W. J.), *An 'Advanced' View of the 'Church Crisis'*, 679-692

SQU

- Sculpture, Rodin's, at Paris Exhibition, 698-697
 Sewage filter-beds, Use of bacteria in, 624-629
 Sin, Remission of, and the doctrine of Indulgences, 159-178, 174-178
 Slums, Demolition of, and re-housing the displaced population, 794-804
 Society women, French and English compared, 64-76
 Soissons (Count de), *Augustin Rodin*, 698-697
 Soldier's life, The, how to make it popular, 177-196, 1056-1068
 Solicitors' remuneration, 868-866
 Sophie Charlotte, first Queen of Prussia, 666-678
 'Sources of Islam, The,' 77-88, 864-868
 South Africa, mining prospects and future taxation in, 226-239
 South Africa, *The Question of the Native Races in*, 367-376
 South African Hospitals Commission, *The*, 396-405
 South African War, 89-56, 142-146, 157, 158, 206-210, 240-247, 537-540, 1064-1066
 Spain's futile efforts to recover Gibraltar, 1012-1021
 Spion Kop, *Thornycroft's Mounted Infantry on*, 39-56
 Stanley, Lady (Maria Holroyd), her early married life, 500-518
 Starling (Prof. Ernest H.), *The Pressing Need for more Universities*, 1028-1037
 Storm-winds symbolised by the winged cherubim, 332-347
 Submarine Boats, *The Admiralty and*, 80-88
 Subsidised steamship communication with East and South Africa, 630-637

TECHNICAL and secondary schools and the Education Bill, 988-1001, 1069

Telegraphs and telephones, Government monopoly in, 348-363

Tennyson (Lord), an epitaph from, for Queen Victoria, 197

Thornycroft's Mounted Infantry on Spion Kop, 39-56; their capture of Marsberg passes, 240-247

Transvaal, *The Economic Outlook in*, 226-239

Transvaal, *The Economic Outlook in*, the, 226-239

THE

- Travartien (John), *Hooliganism*, 89
 Treves (Frederick), *The South African Hospitals Commission*, 396-406
 Trollope, Anthony, *The Novels* 805-816

UNITED States, A tourist's impressions of every-day life in, 918
 United States, Great Britain, and Nicaragua Canal, 100-116, 186, 158

Universities, *The Pressing Need more*, 1028-1037

VAUGHAN (Cardinal), on the H Indulgence at Oberammergau, 174; pastoral on Episcopal authority, 736-754

Verdi, 451-455

Victoria the Good: a Sonnet, 198
 Voluntary Army, *Our Last Effort*, 545-565

Voluntary schools and Board school competition, 326-330

WAR, *The Costs of the*, 729-78
 Waterloo, a year after battle, 510-512

Watts (G. F.), *Our Race as Pioneers*, 849-857

Wheeler (Stephen), *Lord Curzon in India*, 708-718

Wilkins (W. H.), *The First Queen of Prussia*, 666-678

Wilks (Sir Samuel), *Relationship of Hospitals to Medical Schools*, 788

Wilson (H. W.), *The Admiralty and the Navy*, 416-430

Wireless telegraphy and official instruction, 854-857

Wigram (Rev. Dr.), *The Religion of the Boers*, 960-974

Witt (Robert C.), *Romney's Portraits at the Grafton Gallery*, 523-529

Women in Society, *The Role of*, 64
 Woods (Mrs. Margaret L.), *Maria Holroyd*, 500-518

Woodward (William), *The Bridgman and his Competitors*, 416-460

YERBURGH (R.), *The Disaster of the New Army Scheme*, 879-888

